



**EIGHTH REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE
ESTABLISHED IN PURSUANCE OF RESOLUTION 253 (1968)
CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA**

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

**THIRTY-FIRST YEAR
SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT No. 2**

Volume I

**UNITED NATIONS
New York, 1976**

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.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

S/11927/Rev.1

CONTENTS*

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
VOLUME I		
INTRODUCTION	1 - 3	1
<u>Chapter</u>		
I. WORK OF THE COMMITTEE	4 ¹ - 20	2
A. New working procedures	9 - 16	3
B. Consideration of general subjects	17 - 20	5
II. CONSIDERATION OF CASES CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS REPORTS AND NEW CASES CONCERNING POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF SANCTIONS	21 - 60	7
A. General cases	30 - 52	8
B. Cases opened from information supplied by individuals and non-governmental organizations (Case No. INGO-....)	53	12
C. Imports of chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia into the United States of America (Case No. USI-....)	54 - 60	13
III. ACTIONS TAKEN BY GOVERNMENTS IN CONNEXION WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS AND IN RESPONSE TO REQUESTS ADDRESSED TO THEM BY THE COMMITTEE	61 - 73	15
A. Action taken by Governments with respect to specific violations of sanctions	61 - 62	15
B. Transactions conducted with the consent of reporting Governments	63 - 64	16
C. Replies received from Governments with respect to Security Council resolution 333 (1973)	65 - 67	16
D. Publication of lists of Governments that have not responded to the Committee's inquiries within the prescribed period	68 - 72	17
E. Other action taken by a Government in connexion with the implementation of sanctions	73	17

* The report proper and annexes I, IV, V and VI were originally circulated in mimeographed form as document S/11927, and annexes II and III as document S/11927/Add.1. Annex VII appears here for the first time.

CONTENTS (continued)

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
IV. CONSULAR, SPORTING AND OTHER REPRESENTATION OF AND IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND REPRESENTATION OF THE ILLEGAL REGIME IN OTHER COUNTRIES	74 - 87	18
A. Consular offices in Southern Rhodesia	74 - 75	18
B. Southern Rhodesian offices abroad and foreign representation in Southern Rhodesia	76 - 77	18
C. Sporting activities and other international competitions	78 - 87	18
V. AIRLINES OPERATING TO AND FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA	88 - 95	21
VI. IMMIGRATION AND TOURISM	96 - 117	24
A. General information	96 - 103	24
B. Actions taken by the Committee	104 - 117	26
ANNEXES		
Explanatory note		30
Complete list of cases currently under consideration		31
I. Proposals submitted to the Committee on the organization and programme of work and summary of the ensuing discussion		51
II. Cases carried over from previous reports and new cases		60
A. Metallic ores, metals and their alloys		60
B. Mineral fuels		90
C. Tobacco		92
D. Cereals		106
E. Cotton and cotton seeds		109
F. Meat		109
G. Sugar		110
H. Fertilizers and ammonia		112
I. Machinery		123
J. Transport equipment		128
K. Textile fabric and related products		141

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
L.	Sporting activities and other international competitions	144
M.	Banking, insurance and other related facilities	191
N.	Tourism and other related matters	214
O.	Other cases	222

VOLUME II

ANNEXES (continued)

III.	Imports of chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia into the United States of America
IV.	Cases of transactions conducted with the consent or knowledge of reporting Governments
V.	Cases opened from information supplied by individuals and non-governmental organizations
VI.	Note from the Secretary-General and replies from Governments concerning the implementation of paragraph 21 of the Committee's second special report approved by Security Council resolution 333 (1973)
VII.	Note and statistical data prepared by the Secretariat on Southern Rhodesian trade for 1974
Appendix I.	Imports of all commodities to Southern Rhodesia
Appendix II.	Exports of all commodities to Southern Rhodesia
Appendix III.	(a) External trade of South Africa (Customs Union) - Tobacco
	(b) External trade of Mozambique - Tobacco
	(c) External trade of Angola - Tobacco
Appendix IV.	(a) External trade of South Africa (Customs Union) - Asbestos
	(b) External trade of Mozambique - Asbestos
Appendix V.	(a) External trade of South Africa (Customs Union) - Chrome ore
	(b) External trade of Mozambique - Chrome ore

INTRODUCTION

1. The seventh report of the Committee to the Security Council (S/11594/Rev.1) 1/ was adopted on 31 December 1974. Since then, the Committee has held 37 meetings.
2. At the 228th meeting, on 13 February 1975, the Committee unanimously elected Ambassador Salim A. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) Chairman and Mr. Vargas-Saborío (Costa Rica) and Mr. Al-Khudhairy (Iraq) first and second Vice-Chairmen.
3. The present report, adopted on 29 December 1975, covers the period between 16 December 1974 and 15 December 1975. It follows, on the whole, the outline of previous reports in its body and annexes. However, basic information already reported upon has not been reproduced, and various sections have been combined.

1/ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Special Supplement No. 2, vols. I and II.

Chapter I

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

4. General information concerning the Committee and its working procedures may be found in paragraphs 6 to 13 of the seventh report (S/11594/Rev.1).

5. As a result of the Committee's discussion of its programme of work, the following items were deemed acceptable for consideration by the Committee either as procedural measures or as subjects of a general nature. 2/

6. The procedural measures which the Committee decided to include in its programme of work were (a) allocation of meetings alternatively to specific cases or to subjects of a general nature; (b) periodic press conferences by the Chairman of the Committee; (c) the holding of occasional public meetings of the Committee; (d) the question of sending notes of inquiry to, and receiving written replies from, Governments represented on the Committee; (e) the authorization of the Secretariat to prepare notes with no-objection slips concerning sports events.

7. The subjects of a general nature which the Committee decided to include in its programme of work were (a) the expansion of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; (b) the insurance of goods and of passengers going to or from Southern Rhodesia; (c) immigration, tourism and sporting activities involving Southern Rhodesia; (d) the question of the Committee's relationship with the Organization of African Unity (OAU); (e) the establishment of closer contacts with non-governmental organizations; (f) the list of countries to which 20 or more notes concerning violations of sanctions had been sent; (g) interline agreements with Air Rhodesia; (h) a manual of documentation and procedures for goods originating in southern Africa; (i) the question of, and possible methods for, reviewing older cases effectively.

8. Subsequently, the Committee also decided to include the two following procedural proposals in its programme of work: (a) establishment and circulation of lists of Southern Rhodesians involved in sporting activities outside of Southern Rhodesia, and (b) preparation of a third reminder to be sent to Governments which had not replied to the original inquiry despite two reminders. It also decided, in connexion with cases in which the United States Government had reported shipments of goods from Southern Rhodesia while other countries involved in shipping those goods had produced documents showing that the shipments in question were not of Southern Rhodesian origin, to include in its programme of work (general subjects) the question of conflicting reports of Member States on the origin of goods declared to have been imported from Southern Rhodesia.

2/ The proposals, views, conclusions and recommendations of individual delegations on the organization of work may be found in annex I to the present report.

A. New working procedures

9. During the period covered, the Committee took the following decision concerning its working procedures: to meet on a weekly basis; to allocate three meetings in a row to the study of specific cases and then two meetings to the study of general issues, including sports; to arrange, on an ad hoc basis, press conferences by the Chairman; to hold occasional public meetings; to establish and circulate lists of Southern Rhodesians involved in sporting activities outside of Southern Rhodesia; to send a third reminder to Governments which have not replied to the original inquiry despite two reminders; to send notes of inquiry to and receive written replies from Governments represented on the Committee; and to extend the semi-automatic procedure to information gathered from published sources regarding sports events.

(a) Allocation of meetings

10. At its 230th meeting, the Committee discussed the question of meetings to be devoted to either specific cases of sanctions violations or general issues. Taking into account the need to follow a logical sequence and at the same time the need for flexibility, it decided that the first three of a cycle of five meetings should be devoted to the consideration of specific cases and the two following meetings to the study of general issues, including sports.

(b) Ad hoc press conferences by the Chairman

11. At the 231st meeting, some members having observed that press conferences could be a useful means of informing the public, as well as non-members of the Security Council, of the activities of the Committee it was decided that press conferences could be arranged on an ad hoc basis at the request of the Chairman, the officers or other members of the Committee, whenever necessary and as a result of consultations.

(c) Occasional public meetings

12. Also at the 231st meeting, the Committee decided that public meetings should be arranged on the same basis as press conferences, that is, on an ad hoc basis, at the request of the officers or other members of the Committee, in the light of the need for such meetings and as a result of consultations.

(d) Lists of Southern Rhodesians involved in sporting activities outside of Southern Rhodesia

13. At the 240th meeting, the Committee took up the question concerning the participation of Southern Rhodesians in international sporting activities. ^{3/} Concerned that such participation enhanced the status of the illegal régime, the Committee considered that its main objective in that matter was to prevent persons resident in Southern Rhodesia from participating in international sports activities abroad as representatives of Southern Rhodesia, regardless of what travelling documents they used. The view was expressed that information

^{3/} See also chap. IV below.

concerning Southern Rhodesians who had participated or had represented Southern Rhodesia in sporting activities abroad would be useful to Member States in order to enable them to take preventive action in the future. As such, the Committee decided: (i) to make standard the previous procedure followed by the Committee of requesting Governments of States Members of the United Nations to provide it with the full names of Southern Rhodesians who had participated or had represented Southern Rhodesia in sporting activities and events in those countries and full details concerning their travel documents; (ii) to compile, on a periodic basis, a list containing the names of Southern Rhodesians, details of travelling documents, events in which those Southern Rhodesians had participated and the country where all States Members of the United Nations, drawing their attention to those individuals, for any preventive action which could be taken if those same persons attempted to enter a particular country for the purpose of participating in international sporting functions.

(e) Sending of a third reminder

14. At its 242nd meeting, the Committee, noting with regret that a number of Governments had not replied to inquiries from the Committee despite the fact that two reminders had been sent to them in accordance with the established procedure, decided that a third reminder should be addressed to those Governments, drawing their attention to their obligations under paragraphs 20 (b) and 22 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and requesting their urgent co-operation and support before reporting the matter to the Security Council.

(f) Sending notes of inquiry to, and receiving written replies from, Governments represented in the Committee

15. At the 244th meeting, the Committee examined the proposal to send notes of inquiry to, and receive written replies from, the Governments represented on the Committee. It was said in support of that proposal that a standard procedure whereby notes would, when necessary, be addressed to and received from all States, members and non-members of the Committee alike, would ensure that all States received the same treatment, whether or not they were permanent members of the Security Council and/or members of the Committee. Moreover, that procedure would provide the necessary follow-up in terms of a correspondence to which reference could be made after the expiration of the term of a member of the Committee and also provide a complete documentary record of the cases involved. Some delegations, on the other hand, pointed out that to send notes to members of the Committee would be superfluous, since those Governments would have already received the information in question. It was noted also that the existing procedure had elicited satisfactory results in the past and that States which were members of the Committee had generally been more diligent than non-members in providing early replies. In fact, those States members of the Committee were subject to greater pressure when answering questions within the Committee than non-members were in replying to written inquiries. As for the question of ensuring the complete documentary record of cases, the statements made in the Committee's meetings on specific cases were generally also provided in written form; in any event, such statements were reflected in the summary records of relevant meetings. The Committee decided that the proposal to send notes of inquiry to and receive written replies from Governments represented on the Committee was an acceptable procedure.

(g) Extension of the semi-automatic procedure to information gathered from published sources concerning sports events

16. At the same meeting (244th), the attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that the number of international sporting events in which Southern Rhodesians participated outside of Southern Rhodesia, as well as the number of events held within Southern Rhodesia with the participation of foreigners, had increased. Because participation in such events served to bolster the image and prestige of the illegal régime and enhance its moral standing, and because relevant information communicated to the Committee usually referred to events due to take place in the near future, the Committee decided to authorize the Secretariat to draft notes which, subject to the Committee's approval, would be sent to the Governments concerned in accordance with the established semi-automatic procedure.

B. Consideration of general subjects

17. During the period covered, the Committee examined the following items from the list of general subjects included in its programme of work: relationship with OAU; establishment of closer contacts with non-governmental organizations; expansion of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; insurance of goods and of passengers going to or from Southern Rhodesia; interline agreements with Air Rhodesia; and immigration, tourism and sporting activities involving Southern Rhodesia.

(a) Relationship with the Organization of African Unity

18. The Committee considered that in order to render its endeavours more efficient, a working procedure should be developed with OAU with a view to establishing closer co-operation. Accordingly, as a follow-up to the good relationship already developed and reported in chapter VII of the seventh report, the Committee resumed its discussion on the matter and decided, at its 235th meeting on 30 April 1975, that (i) a representative of OAU should be invited to attend meetings of the Committee at which would be discussed violations of sanctions directly or indirectly involving any member country or countries of OAU; (ii) the Committee's documents should be made available to the representative of OAU under the same confidentiality to which members of the Committee were also subject and with the same restrictions as to their dissemination; and (iii) the Chairman or Vice-Chairmen of the Committee should make more regular contacts with OAU than had been the case in the past. In implementation of those decisions, the representative of OAU was invited to attend the 236th meeting on 8 May 1975, at which he was officially welcomed. Since then, he has been invited to attend meetings at which cases involving OAU members were discussed.

(b) Closer contact with non-governmental organizations

19. At its 233rd meeting on 10 April 1975, the Committee, in its efforts to establish closer contacts with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which provided valuable information, and to enhance its level of co-operation with them, decided that (i) in addition to sending notes of acknowledgement, a note of appreciation should also be sent when appropriate, in reply to communications

received from NGOs, (ii) the NGOs with which the Committee wished to establish closer contacts should receive essential documentation, such as the Committee's annual and special reports and press releases; (iii) a list of all NGOs from which the Committee had received communications since 1973 should be prepared with all pertinent information; (iv) NGO representatives should be invited to address the Committee if they were in a position to provide helpful information and after the members of the Committee had been consulted on the subject; and (v) a new appeal for information should be made to NGOs, similar to the one issued in September 1973 but also indicating that NGO representatives who were in New York and had useful information to impart to the Committee might contact the Committee's secretariat to request a hearing from the Committee. In implementation of those decisions, a list was established of the NGOs which had sent communications to the Committee. The Committee also issued a press release on 21 May 1975 in which it appealed to NGOs for new information on possible violations of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, in particular, information regarding sanctions-breaking operations, especially on such matters relating to Southern Rhodesia as trade or promotion of trade, including any transport of goods, participation in financial or investment transactions, encouragement of emigration or tourism, foreign travel by Southern Rhodesians and their activities abroad, as well as the maintenance of any relations or any representation, official or unofficial, with Southern Rhodesia. It requested that reliable and detailed information about such activities or any others likely to support or encourage the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia in possible violation of sanctions be reported by NGOs to national authorities and/or direct to the Committee. Authorship of information sent to the Committee by NGOs would, if desired, be treated as confidential. On the same date, the appeal was forwarded to the NGOs on the Committee's list.

(c) Expansion of sanctions and other general subjects examined by the Committee

20. The Committee examined also the expansion of sanctions, on which, because of its particular importance, it decided to issue a special report to the Security Council (S/11913) ^{4/} dated 15 December 1975. In connexion with that question, the Committee examined the following items: insurance of goods and of passengers going to and from Southern Rhodesia; trade names and franchises; interline agreements with Air Rhodesia; request to Member States to deny landing rights in their respective territories to flights the route schedule of which included stop-overs in Southern Rhodesia for the purpose of loading or unloading passengers and/or goods to and from Southern Rhodesia; and immigration, tourism and sporting activities involving Southern Rhodesia. Additional details on sporting activities may be found in chapter IV of the present report, information on interline agreements in chapter V, and information on immigration and tourism in chapter VI.

^{4/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1975.

Chapter II

CONSIDERATION OF CASES CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS REPORTS AND NEW CASES CONCERNING POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF SANCTIONS

21. During the period between 16 December 1974 and 15 December 1975, the Committee continued examination of 81 of the cases of suspected violations of the provisions of resolution 253 (1968) established by the Security Council against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia listed in annexes II to V of its seventh report. It also considered 49 new cases brought to its attention. Furthermore, the Committee decided that eight cases should be considered closed.

22. The present section covers those cases in which there have been noteworthy developments during the period under review. The fact that some cases are merely mentioned in passing or even omitted entirely from this succinct analysis means only that the current inquiries being conducted by the Committee have not produced any new and decisive information.

23. As was the case last year, a relatively large number of cases concerning tourism in Southern Rhodesia and sporting activities inside and outside that Territory were opened, in addition to cases concerning industrial, commercial and financial transactions.

24. As in the past, whenever the Committee received sufficiently reliable information concerning possible violations of sanctions, it requested the Secretary-General to communicate it to the Governments concerned, so that they might investigate them, take appropriate action if so required and provide the Committee with any further information available to them in accordance with paragraphs 20 and 22 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

25. Whenever the information transmitted in response to the Committee's request appeared insufficient, the Committee requested additional information, including copies of the commercial documentation submitted to the investigating authorities. In that regard, the Committee feels that it should receive copies of such documentation as a matter of routine in any investigated case, both for its own information and, when necessary, for transmission to other Governments potentially concerned, except, of course, when confidentiality is requested.

26. In that connexion, the Committee again drew the attention of the Governments concerned to the fact that, in the prevailing circumstances, bills of lading and Chamber of Commerce certificates emanating from South Africa should not be regarded as sufficient proof of origin. The Committee noted with regret that certain Governments continued to allow the importation of cargoes on the basis of such suspect documentation. It recommended that the investigating authorities should seek the documentation suggested in the memorandum on the application of

sanctions of 2 September 1969, which was transmitted to the Governments of all Member States and States members of the United Nations specialized agencies on 18 September 1969 (see S/9844/Rev.1, 5/ annex VI).

27. With regard to cases of imports of chrome, nickel and other materials into the United States of America, members of the Committee deplored again that a permanent member of the Security Council persisted in allowing its nationals to conduct transactions that contravened the mandatory resolutions adopted by the Security Council.

28. The Committee also stated its regret and its concern that, despite the hope expressed in paragraph 89 of the seventh report of the Committee, the Government of Switzerland did not seem to have found it possible to reinforce legislative measures concerning the implementation of sanctions.

29. Detailed information concerning cases examined by the Committee since the publication of its seventh report is contained in annexes II to V of the present report. Some information is briefly reviewed below in the following order: general cases, opened on the basis of information received from Governments or gathered from published sources (those referred to as Case No. ...), cases opened on the basis of information provided to the Committee by the individuals and non-governmental organizations (those referred to as Case No. INGO-...) and cases opened in connexion with information provided by the United States Government concerning imports of goods of Southern Rhodesian origin into the United States (those referred to as Case No. USI-...).

A. General cases

(a) Metallic ores, metals and their alloys

30. With regard to the commodities in this category, the Committee dealt with 15 cases already mentioned in its seventh report. It also examined one new case, Case No. 212 (ferrochrome). The shipment in question was alleged to be of Southern Rhodesian origin and destined for Brazil aboard the vessel Gerd Wesch registered in the Federal Republic of Germany. The Government concerned (Federal Republic of Germany) informed the Committee that the vessel had been on a time charter since February 1974 to a South African company and that the shipping company itself had no control whatsoever over the cargo. The master of the vessel was unable to investigate the origin of the merchandise. Such inquiries could be made by the charterer only.

31. The Committee examined Case No. 184 (nickel) and, in view of the information and documentation provided by the Government concerned, decided to close the case. No further information was received concerning the other cases in this category mentioned in the previous reports.

5/ Ibid., Twenty-fifth Year, Special Supplement No. 3.

(b) Mineral fuels

32. The Committee pursued the examination of Case No. 187 (coking coal) and decided to close the case. No new cases concerning the above commodity have been opened by the Committee.

(c) Tobacco

33. During the period under review, two new cases concerning tobacco were brought to the attention of the Committee (Case Nos. 202 and 207). The Committee examined six cases already mentioned in its seventh report. The Committee decided to close Case Nos. 164 and 169.

34. Regarding Case No. 196, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Committee in October 1975 concerning judicial action taken by the district court of Rotterdam against the director of a Rotterdam firm of forwarding agents which imported tobacco from Southern Rhodesia (see para. 62 (e) below).

(d) Cereals

35. Since the seventh report, no new cases of cereal transactions have been opened. The Committee continued examination of Case No. 124, Armonia.

(e) Cotton and cotton seeds

36. During the period under review, no new cases concerning suspected transactions in cotton and cotton seeds have been brought to the Committee's attention.

(f) Meat

37. No new cases of meat transactions have been opened since the submission of the seventh report. The Committee continued examination of Case No. 117, Drymakos.

(g) Sugar

38. The Committee continued consideration of two cases already mentioned in the seventh report: Case No. 112, Evangelos M. and Case No. 147, Anangel Ambition. No new cases of suspected violation in this commodity have been opened.

(h) Fertilizers and ammonia

39. The Committee was informed of attempts by companies in Southern Rhodesia to import large quantities of agricultural crop chemicals and, accordingly, a new case (Case No. 204) was opened. The information was to the effect that chemical companies concerned urgently required a substantial number of chemical compounds, many of which were of vital importance in the production of tobacco or cotton. The chemical quantities required were 5,326 tons and 1,350,000 litres. The

Committee decided to transmit that information to the Governments of all Member States and States members of the United Nations specialized agencies for any action that they might consider necessary. Case No. 113, already reported in the seventh report, is still under active consideration.

(i) Machinery

40. Following the submission of its seventh report, the Committee considered two new cases of suspected violations of sanctions involving the export of rolling mill rolls (Case No. 209) and the supply of electrical equipment (Case No. 221) to Southern Rhodesia.

41. In Case No. 209, the information was received in June 1975 to the effect that an Austrian company, Eisenwerk Sulzau-Werfen, of Vienna, had arranged to supply rolling mill rolls to Southern Rhodesia. Payment for the rolling mill rolls amounting to approximately 600,000 Austrian schillings 6/ was to be made by a Southern Rhodesian bank, possibly through intermediary banking channels, to the Austrian company's account. The Committee brought the matter to the attention of the Austrian Government, which stated, in its reply, that the consignment in question probably concerned two shipments of rolling mill rolls dispatched to a South African company, care of Rennies Consolidated (Pty) Ltd., Port Elizabeth.

42. The other case recently opened dealt with a consignment of electrical equipment destined for Southern Rhodesia (Case No. 221). The information was to the effect that a Belgian company, Electro-thermil Philips - ACEC, SA, of Herstal, was supplying, on a regular basis, items of electrical equipment, including transformers and capacitors, to a Southern Rhodesian company, Morewear Industries (Rhod) (PVT), Ltd., Salisbury. The Committee decided to communicate the matter to the Belgian Government for possible investigation.

43. The Committee continued consideration of the replies received in connexion with four cases already mentioned in the seventh report (Case Nos. 161, 170, 177, and 189) and decided to close Case No. 161 (electrical generating equipment) and Case No. 177 (machine tools).

(j) Transport equipment

44. In addition to pursuing the examination of six cases already reported in the seventh report, the Committee opened one new case of suspected violation of sanctions brought to its attention during the period under review (Case No. 206, jet fighters and other military equipment). The information, which had been received from published sources, indicated that agents from the illegal régime in Salisbury had discussed with Venezuelan businessmen an offer to buy 28 American-built Sabre jets for £6.3 million to strengthen the Rhodesian Air Force. The illegal régime was also said to be looking for more planes, helicopters and arms, possibly in Latin America. The Committee drew the matter to the attention of the Government of Venezuela, and, in addition, decided to have a note sent to all

6/ Equivalent to \$R 19,400 at the rates of exchange of 1S (Austrian) = \$US 0.057415 and \$R 1 = \$US 1.776 obtaining in June 1975.

Member States, drawing their attention to the information and requesting them to take all possible measures to prevent the occurrence of activities that would be contrary to the application of sanctions against that régime. The Government of Venezuela, in its reply, stated that the reported information was absolutely groundless.

45. The Committee also pursued the examination of Case No. 197 concerning the reported supply of motor vehicles for possible use of the military or police forces in Southern Rhodesia, by a Swiss Company, Anacardia, S.A. In its reply to the Committee's inquiry, the Swiss Government said that the results of the investigation carried out by the competent federal authorities had not confirmed the allegations reported above. The Committee felt it necessary to request further information on the basis of which the investigating authorities had reached their conclusions.

(k) Textiles and related products

46. No new cases concerning suspected transactions in textiles and related products have been opened by the Committee since its seventh report. The Committee pursued examination of Case No. 150, Straat Nagasaki, and Case No. 152, Ise Maru, and decided to close them.

(l) Sporting activities and other international competitions

47. The Committee pursued the study of seven cases of sporting activities and other international competitions already mentioned in its last report and opened 19 new cases (Case Nos. 198, 199, 205, 211, 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231 and 234). More information on these cases may be found in chapter IV C of this report. In view of the increasing number of sporting events involving Southern Rhodesians brought to its attention and the fact that such activities, which are contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council provisions establishing the sanctions, were a clear attempt by the illegal régime to obtain international recognition, the Committee decided to give the matter greater consideration.

(m) Banking insurance and other related facilities

48. During the period under review, the Committee pursued the consideration of three cases concerning the above activities already dealt with in the seventh report (Case Nos. 163, 171 and 176). Among those, the Committee kept Case No. 171 concerning the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation (RISCO), under active consideration. In addition, the Committee opened two new cases (Case No. 203, concerning payments by a Southern Rhodesian bank to a European bank, Creditanstalt Bankverein, Vienna, and Case No. 208, concerning a financial loan to a Southern Rhodesian company, Rhodesian Alloys, Ltd.).

49. With regard to Case No. 163, opened on information that a Swiss company, Industrie Maschinen, of Zurich, had made a loan to Rhodesia Railways, the Swiss Government indicated that the investigation conducted by the federal authorities could not find any support to that allegation. It was further stated that the President of the Board of Directors of the company involved had given his formal assurance that no such transaction was contemplated or carried out.

50. The Committee continued its consideration of Case No. 176 concerning two insurance companies registered in New Zealand, i.e., the New Zealand Insurance Company Limited, and the South British Insurance Company Limited, and their relationship with two companies, the New Zealand Insurance Company (South Africa) and The South British Insurance Company Limited, reported to be operating in Southern Rhodesia. The Government of New Zealand indicated that the New Zealand Insurance Company (South Africa) was a subsidiary of the New Zealand-based Insurance Company Limited and that the other firm reported to be operating in Southern Rhodesia was under the control of the New Zealand-based company of the same name. It was also stated in that reply that the investigation conducted by the governmental authorities had not revealed any indication that the companies had violated the sanctions established by the Security Council, and the firms concerned had given specific assurances that no moneys had been transferred to Southern Rhodesia.

(n) Tourism and other related matters

51. Three new cases concerning tourism and other related matters have been submitted to the Committee (Case No. 200, publication of a tourist guide to Southern Rhodesia; Case No. 213, flights to and from Southern Rhodesia; and Case No. 227, organized tours abroad with the use of Southern Rhodesian passports). The Committee also pursued the examination of one case already indicated in the seventh report (Case No. 190, tourism agencies in Southern Rhodesia). No further information on Case No. 194 was provided by the representative of the United States (see para. 112 below). Additional information on cases related to tourism may be found in chapter VI below.

(o) Other cases

52. Regarding other cases of possible violations of sanctions not listed under specific headings, the Committee opened four new cases (Case Nos. 201, 210, 214, and 218). The first three cases dealt with trading activities with Southern Rhodesia and the fourth with the participation of a Southern Rhodesian representative at a meeting of the International Chamber of Commerce. The Committee also pursued the examination of Case Nos. 154, 155 and 159 referred to in the previous report. It should be noted that Case No. 154, Tango Romeo, is still under active consideration.

B. Cases opened from information supplied by individuals and non-governmental organizations (Case No. INGO-...)

53. The Committee opened six new cases on the basis of information supplied by individuals and non-governmental organizations: Case No. INGO-7, tourism and travel to and from Southern Rhodesia; Case No. INGO-8, concerning tourism, immigration and transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia; Case No. INGO-9, Cargo Air Transport; Case No. INGO-10, packaged tours to Southern Rhodesia and landing rights to airlines flying to Salisbury; Case No. INGO-11, tour to Southern Rhodesia organized by a travel agency located in the United Kingdom; and Case No. INGO-12, trading activities and other relations with Southern Rhodesia. It also continued the examination of five cases already reported upon in the seventh report (Case Nos. INGO-2, INGO-3, INGO-4, INGO-5, and INGO-6).

C. Imports of chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia into the United States of America (Case No. USI-...)

54. The Committee pursued the examination of 19 cases of importation of Southern Rhodesian chrome, nickel and other related materials into the United States of America already reported upon in the previous report. It also opened six new cases during the period under review. Those transactions had occurred with the knowledge of the United States Government in conformity with legislation (the so-called Byrd amendment) that had become effective on 1 January 1972. The information in question is regularly provided to the Committee by the United States representative.

55. During the period covered, the Committee received the following communications from the United States Mission to the United Nations regarding shipments of ferrochrome, chrome ore, asbestos fibre, nickel cathodes and silicon:

(a) A letter dated 17 March 1975, transmitting a report on 17 shipments imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia between 1 October 1974 to 31 December 1974. Those shipments, which had a total weight of 62,223 short tons, had been transported aboard vessels registered in Greece (2), Liberia (2), Panama (1), and the United States (12).

(b) A letter dated 16 July 1975, transmitting a report on 26 shipments imported between 1 January 1975 and 30 June 1975. Those shipments, which had a total weight of 73,039 short tons, had been transported aboard vessels registered in the Netherlands (1), Pakistan (1), Panama (1) and the United States (23).

(c) A letter dated 14 November 1975, transmitting a report on 17 shipments imported between 1 July and 30 September 1975. These shipments, with a total weight of 37,062 short tons, had been transported aboard vessels registered in Panama (5) and the United States (12).

56. The Committee examined the reports and decided that in view of the need of keeping the international community regularly informed, it should continue making public the information thus received. Accordingly, press communiqués were issued on 8 April 1975, 19 August 1975 and 29 December 1975, respectively, containing the names of the carriers, their country of registry and other particulars included in the United States reports.

57. The Committee, in accordance with the established procedure, decided that the attention of the countries of registry of the vessels involved should be drawn to those illegal transactions. It therefore asked the Secretary-General to request the Governments concerned to investigate the circumstances in which cargoes of Southern Rhodesian origin, the carriage of which is prohibited by paragraph 3 (c) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), were shipped aboard vessels under their registry.

58. Details of the above-mentioned cases of imports into the United States, including the replies received from Governments, can be found in annex II to the present report. Given the fact, however, that in some cases, conflicting reports as to the origin of the goods transported have been received from other countries, the nationals of which had been involved in the same transactions, it may be useful to mention here the substance of some statements in that connexion.

(a) In Case Nos. USI-14, USI-16, USI-18-22 and USI-27, concerning the Dundas Shipping and Trading Co., Ltd., Montreal, Canada, the Canadian Government forwarded copies of the documentation received and stated that:

"As a result of the investigation, the Canadian Government has come to the conclusion that there are no grounds upon which a prosecution of Dundas Shipping could be launched in a Canadian court of law. One of the major obstacles facing the Canadian authorities in attempting to pursue this case was the fact that they were unable to obtain conclusive evidence to prove that the shipments carried were, in fact, of Rhodesian origin ... Dundas Shipping has certificates of origin (albeit suspect) ascertaining that the cargoes are of South African origin."

(b) Concerning Case Nos. USI-19, USI-30, USI-31 and USI-33, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Committee that neither the documentation nor the bills of lading contain any indication concerning a possible Southern Rhodesian origin of these cargoes.

(c) In Case No. USI-26, Weser Express, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the vessel did not call at the port of Norfolk, Virginia (USA), on 5 January 1974 but on 31 December 1973 and 25 January 1974, and that during none of those voyages did the vessel have nickel cathodes aboard.

59. Regarding Case No. USI-27, the representative of the United States of America confirmed to the Committee, at its 234th meeting, that the Stockenfels, which was found to be a vessel registered in the Federal Republic of Germany had delivered either 1,005 or 1,108 tons of ferrochrome silicon to Burnside, Louisiana, on 5 February 1974, that the shipment originated in Lourenço Marques and that the ferrochrome silicon in question was Southern Rhodesian.

60. Regarding the Case Nos. USI-19, USI-26 and USI-33, the United States representative stated, at the 253rd meeting, that his Government in an effort to clear up the matter with the Governments involved, would send communications to the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands, the countries concerned, stating that the quarterly reports to the Security Council showed that a particular vessel had called at a particular port on a given date and that that information had been given to the Department of State by the Department of the Treasury and was based on United States Customs documents. The communications would also state that if the Governments concerned wished to pursue the matter, they should contact the Department of the Treasury of the United States Government (Office of Foreign Assets Control, Washington, D.C.) (see para. 8 above).

Chapter III

ACTIONS TAKEN BY GOVERNMENTS IN CONNEXION WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS AND IN RESPONSE TO REQUESTS ADDRESSED TO THEM BY THE COMMITTEE

A. Action taken by Governments with respect to specific violations of sanctions

61. During the period covered by the present report, the Committee was informed of a number of legal proceedings that had been initiated by Governments, either on the basis of information brought to their attention by the Committee or on their own initiative.

62. In the following cases, legal proceedings led to conviction:

(a) By a note dated 10 January 1975, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, referring to Case No. 170 concerning a shipment of spare parts for sewing or knitting machines, informed the Committee that a fine of DM 5,000 had been imposed on the company Gebr. Sheller, of Eislingen. By a further note dated 27 June, the Federal Government reported that two other companies found to be involved in the same transactions were being fined several thousand deutsch marks each.

(b) By a communication dated 10 July 1975, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Committee that, in January 1975, a citizen of the Federal Republic who had placed a want ad in the Süddeutsche Zeitung for 300 "safari participants" for Southern Rhodesia had been arrested and taken into custody on suspicion of recruiting soldiers for the Southern Rhodesian army in violation of article 109 (h) of the national penal code. Investigation had confirmed that fact and on 19 May 1975, he had been convicted by a criminal court in Munich and sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment.

(c) By a note dated 4 March 1975 the Government of the Netherlands, with reference to Case No. INGO-2 concerning tobacco transactions with Southern Rhodesia, informed the Committee that, on 13 June 1974, the district court in Amsterdam had imposed a fine on the two managers of the Etablissement Zephyr Holland, BV, in the amount of f. 10,000 each, it having been proved that they had acted in defiance of the provisions of the law, in accordance with which the import and export of goods from and to Southern Rhodesia is prohibited.

(d) At the 243rd meeting on 3 July, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that a manufacturing company, Compair Industrial, Ltd., of Buckinghamshire, United Kingdom, had been fined a total of £7,450 for seven offences of transporting compressors to docks for export to Southern Rhodesia.

(e) By a note dated 31 October 1975, the Government of the Netherlands, informed the Committee that, with reference to Case No. 196 concerning the shipment of tobacco of Southern Rhodesia origin, the district court of Rotterdam had imposed

a fine upon the director of a Rotterdam firm of forwarding agents. However, the District Attorney had appealed the sentence, since he could not agree with the court's decision not to impose an additional penalty.

B. Transactions conducted with the consent of reporting Governments

63. The Government of Denmark, replying to a request for information about a report that it had exported to Southern Rhodesia merchandise valued at Dkr. 419,000 during the period January-September 1974, informed the Committee by a note dated 26 June 1975, that supplies valued at Dkr. 406,430 and intended strictly for medical purposes had been exported to Southern Rhodesia and that it was investigating the balance of the sum involved.

64. By a note dated 15 July 1975, the Government of Austria informed the Committee that it had authorized, on the basis of humanitarian considerations, the import into Austria of handicrafts produced by the Jairos Jiri Association for the Rehabilitation of the Blind and Disabled Africans in Southern Rhodesia.

C. Replies received from Governments with respect to Security Council resolution 333 (1973)

65. At its 1716th meeting on 22 May 1973, the Security Council adopted resolution 333 (1973), by which, among other things, it approved the recommendations contained in paragraphs 10 to 22 of the Committee's second special report (S/10920). 7/ Actions taken in connexion with those recommendations and subsequent developments were described in the Committee's sixth and seventh reports to the Council (see S/11178/Rev.1, 8/ chap. II and S/11594/Rev.1, chap. III).

66. In reply to the note which was sent to the States concerned in connexion with paragraph 21 of the second special report, which referred to discrepancies between the quantities of certain commodities said to have been imported from South Africa, Mozambique and Angola and the quantities reported to have been exported by those countries, additional communications were received from Greece, Malaysia, Mexico and Turkey. In accordance with the decision taken by the Council, the substantive parts of these replies are reproduced in annex VI of this report.

67. In connexion with paragraph 22 of the second special report, which called upon States to inform the Committee on the steps which they had taken with regard to a number of recommendations contained in that report, additional replies were received from the Bahamas, Botswana, the German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Jamaica, Laos, Mauritius and Turkey.

7/ See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1973.

8/ Ibid., Twenty-ninth Year, Special Supplement No. 2.

D. Publication of lists of Governments that have not responded to the Committee's inquiries within the prescribed period

68. In accordance with the recommendations contained in paragraph 18 of its second special report (S/10920), the Committee has continued to publish lists of Governments that have not responded to its inquiries within the prescribed period.

69. Since publication of the seventh report, three new lists have been issued: on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November.

70. At the time of preparation of the present report, replies were overdue and still awaited from Botswana, Brazil, Cyprus, Gabon, Greece, Jordan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Panama, Portugal, South Africa, Venezuela, Zaire and Zambia.

71. The Committee noted with regret that among the Governments from which replies were outstanding, Liberia and Panama, to which, as reported in paragraph 106 of the seventh report (S/11594/Rev.1), comprehensive notes had been sent, had again been placed on the list. The Committee also felt it necessary to send, on 2 April 1975, a comprehensive note to Greece, which had been involved in numerous cases and failed to provide sufficient replies to the Committee's inquiries. The Committee has since received from those three countries some of the information requested but considered it still insufficient.

72. The Committee decided to entrust its secretariat with the task of preparing a summary on the cases involving Switzerland. The summary will be considered by the Committee in the near future.

E. Other action taken by a Government in connexion with the implementation of sanctions

73. At the 243rd meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to a letter dated 27 June 1975 (S/11738), 9/ by which the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General that, in view of the achievement of independence by Mozambique on 25 June 1975, his Government had discontinued the regular patrol (popularly known as the "Beira patrol") which vessels of the Royal Navy had hitherto maintained off the coast of Mozambique. The letter further stated that for more than nine years the patrol had been successful in preventing the pumping of oil through the pipeline from Beira to Southern Rhodesia and that with the accession to power of an independent Government in Mozambique, such patrolling was no longer necessary.

9/ Ibid., Thirtieth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1975.

Chapter IV

CONSULAR, SPORTING AND OTHER REPRESENTATION OF AND IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND REPRESENTATION OF THE ILLEGAL REGIME IN OTHER COUNTRIES

A. Consular offices in Southern Rhodesia

74. In paragraph 114 of the Committee's seventh report, it was stated that foreign consular offices were being maintained by South Africa and Portugal in Southern Rhodesia.

75. During the period covered by the present report, the Committee has not been informed of any development on the matter concerning South African representation. Concerning Portugal, the Committee received information from published sources that in August 1975 the Portuguese consulates in Umtali and Bulawayo had been closed.

B. Southern Rhodesian offices abroad and foreign representation in Southern Rhodesia

76. Also, in paragraph 115 of the seventh report, the Committee indicated that Southern Rhodesia was maintaining diplomatic or consular missions or information offices in Mozambique, Portugal, South Africa and the United States of America. It was also stated that Air Rhodesia kept offices in Beira, Lourenço Marques and Vilanculos (Mozambique); Blantyre (Malawi); Cape Town, Durban and Johannesburg (South Africa).

77. On 10 April 1975, the Committee was informed that the Portuguese Government had decided to close down the Southern Rhodesian information office in Portugal.

C. Sporting activities and other international competitions

78. In paragraphs 118 to 148 of its seventh report, the Committee emphasized that it was viewing with particular concern the increasing efforts by the illegal régime to obtain recognition at the international level through sporting activities and other types of competitions. During the period covered in the present report, the Committee pursued its efforts to foil such attempts.

79. Since the seventh report, the Committee has opened 19 new cases on this subject. It has also pursued the examination of seven cases reported upon last year.

80. In a number of cases the Committee addressed notes to Member States of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies asking for their co-operation. It also addressed communications to international or regional sports organizations expressing the hope that Southern Rhodesian sporting associations would not receive international recognition.

81. In that connexion, the Committee welcomed the decision taken by the International Olympic Committee on 22 May 1975 to withdraw its recognition of Southern Rhodesia and exclude it from the 1976 Olympic Games. In a press communiqué issued on 12 June 1975, the Committee pointed out that the initiative taken by the International Olympic Committee should be followed as an example by all international and regional sports organizations of which Southern Rhodesia was still a member. In that press communiqué, the Committee also renewed its appeal to all Member States to take the necessary steps, through their national sports associations and clubs, as well as international sporting federations and associations, to have Southern Rhodesian membership in the various international or regional sporting bodies rejected or terminated.

82. Considering also that participation in matches and sporting activities abroad by persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia had, in a number of cases, been facilitated by the fact that those persons travelled on foreign passports, the Committee decided to include that question in its discussion regarding the expansion of sanctions, on which a special report has been submitted to the Security Council (S/11913). In a further effort to provide Member States with additional and useful information for the conduct of their inquiries, the Committee decided to make standard the procedure of requesting Governments involved in cases related to sporting activities to provide the full names of Southern Rhodesians who participated in those events, as well as details on their travelling documents. Then, lists could be established of such participants and communicated to all countries concerned to facilitate their investigations in accordance with their obligations.

83. As already indicated, detailed information concerning cases is contained in annex II to the present report. The salient facts concerning some cases are as follows:

(a) Southern Rhodesia and the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA) (Case No. 181)

84. Concerning Case No. 181, previously reported upon in the seventh report, the Committee decided, having been informed that Southern Rhodesian sportsmen were trying to obtain their association's readmission to FIFA, that a note should be sent to all Member States requesting them to draw the attention of their national associations to the matter. A letter was also sent by the Chairman of the Committee to the Federation requesting its support for the efforts of the Committee in the matter.

(b) Argentine hockey umpire visit to Southern Rhodesia (Case No. 217)

85. Case No. 217 was opened on the basis of information gathered from published sources, according to which a prominent hockey umpire of Argentinian nationality was visiting Southern Rhodesia. Replying to a request from the Committee, the Government of Argentina, pointing out that all sporting activities with Southern Rhodesia had been prohibited by its national legislation, said that it had no

knowledge of the travel in question. The Government added that the sports official concerned was not a member of the Argentine Hockey Association but of the International Hockey Association, which had its headquarters in Belgium. The Committee, pursuing its research, received little information about the sportsman. It was informed, however, that Southern Rhodesia was a full member of the International Hockey Federation. It took up the matter with the Federation expressing the view that the Southern Rhodesian association should be expelled from it, and decided to bring the matter to the attention of all Member States, requesting them to impress on hockey associations under their jurisdiction the seriousness with which the Committee viewed the situation and requesting their support.

(c) Southern Rhodesia and the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF)
(Case No. 219)

86. The Committee received information gathered from published sources, according to which Southern Rhodesia had been readmitted to the Davis Cup Tennis competitions and had been drawn to play against Ireland. It decided to send a note to all Member States whose national tennis associations are members of ILTF deploring the readmission of Southern Rhodesia into that organization. It also sent an appropriate letter to ILTF. Meanwhile, the Government of Ireland informed the Committee that it was already dealing with the matter. Subsequently, the Committee learned that the Southern Rhodesian team had withdrawn from the proposed match.

(d) Southern Rhodesia and the International Amateur Swimming Federation
(FINA) (Case No. 220)

87. Case No. 220 involves an attempt by a Southern Rhodesian association to obtain international recognition through membership in the International Amateur Swimming Federation. As in similar cases, the Committee took up the matter with the Federation and decided to send a note to the Member States whose national associations are members of the Federation.

Chapter V

AIRLINES OPERATING TO AND FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

88. In its previous annual reports, the Committee indicated that, according to information it had received, direct flights existed between Southern Rhodesia on one side and Malawi, Mozambique, and South Africa, on the other. During the period covered by the present report, the Committee received further information to the effect that ~~those~~ three countries and Portugal eventually maintained such direct air links with Southern Rhodesia.

89. The Committee decided that some time should be allowed to the newly established Government of Mozambique to clarify its position regarding the application of sanctions but that notes should be sent to the three other Governments concerned, drawing their attention to the fact that such air links would be a clear violation of the sanctions provisions, in particular paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

(a) Sale of three Boeing aircraft to Air Rhodesia (Case No. 144)

90. Case No. 144 was reviewed in the Committee's seventh report (S/11594/Rev.1, paras. 73, 151 and 152). Subsequently, the Committee was informed that an indefinite denial of all United States export privileges had been taken by the United States Department of Commerce against the firm Overseas Holidays and Aircraft Hire (Pty.), Ltd., Braamfontein, South Africa. It was further stated that the decision to do so had been taken on the basis of an investigation which had revealed that the above-mentioned company had taken delivery of the three aircraft sold to Air Rhodesia several days prior to their arrival in Salisbury.

(b) Flights by private companies (Case No. 154: Tango Romeo)

91. Following the Committee's review of Case No. 154 in its seventh report (S/11594/Rev.1, paras. 153 and 154), the representative of the United States informed the Committee, at the 236th meeting on 8 May 1975, that an indefinite denial of all United States export privileges had been issued against Compagnie Gabonaise d'Affrètement Aérien (Affretair) of Libreville, Gabon, by the United States Department of Commerce. That action had followed the issuance in October 1974 of a 60-day temporary denial order against the firm, which had been issued because Affretair had falsely represented to officials of the United States Government that a Douglas DC-8 55F Jet Trader aircraft would not be utilized in traffic with Southern Rhodesia or in any manner contrary to the United Nations sanctions. The Committee requested the comments of the Government of Gabon on the matter and that it be kept informed of any developments concerning the activities of the company involved. It also requested the comments of the Government of the Netherlands regarding information to the effect that the plane in question (Tango Romeo), for which a request for aircraft parts had been turned down by the United States authorities, had been repaired at the Schiphol Airport (Netherlands). In its reply dated 11 August 1975, the

Netherlands Government stated that in the course of the inquiry by the Netherlands authorities it was indicated that fuel had been purveyed to the plane by Mobil Oil and that no unlawful act could be established in that connexion. According to information subsequently available to the Committee, the aircraft was reported to have been in Honolulu, Hawaii (USA). Subsequently, the representative of the United States, responding to the Committee's inquiry, stated that an investigation carried out by the appropriate authorities had established that the aircraft in question had never been in Hawaii. As of the preparation of the present report no reply had been received from the Government of Gabon.

(c) Cargo Air Transport (Case No. INGO-9)

92. During the period covered by the present report, the Committee opened Case No. INGO-9 on the basis of information received from a non-governmental organization regarding the establishment in Belgium of an air transport company, Cargo Air Transport, allegedly created for the purpose of undertaking commercial transport to Southern Rhodesia. The Government of Belgium reported to the Committee that, following intervention by the Belgian authorities, the company had abandoned its plan to request registration. Subsequently, the Committee was informed that the company's aircraft, a DC-6, had left Brussels for Amsterdam, where control over the plane purportedly was assumed by the Compagnie Affretair registered in Gabon and already mentioned in connexion with Case No. 154 referred to under (b) above. Accordingly, the Committee then brought the matter to the attention of the Governments of Gabon and the Netherlands. In its reply dated 10 December 1975, the Government of the Netherlands stated that the competent authorities had no knowledge of a company called Cargo Air Transport. They knew, however, that Compagnie Affretair had at its disposal a DC-8 aircraft, which was flying mainly between the Netherlands and Gabon with goods principally destined for South Africa.

(d) Purchase of DC-8 aircraft by Affretair (Gabon) (Case No. 232)

93. During the period covered in the present report, the Committee also opened Case No. 232 on the basis of a note dated 28 November 1975 whereby the United Kingdom transmitted to the Committee information to the effect that Southern Rhodesia had recently acquired a DC-8 aircraft TR-LVK, which was to be operated by Affretair. The Committee decided to alert Member States to the probability that the aircraft in question would engage in sanctions-breaking and to request them to ensure that, in the event of the aircraft entering their territories, it did not deliver cargoes from or pick up cargoes destined for, Southern Rhodesia. Subsequently, the United States representative informed the Committee that preliminary investigation had revealed that an aircraft apparently identical to the DC-8 aircraft mentioned in the British note had been sold in the spring of 1975 to a Belgian charter firm named Cargo Air Transport. No indication or evidence having appeared that the aircraft would be subsequently transferred to Affretair or would be used in any way in Southern Rhodesian trade, an export licence had been issued to cover that transaction. Apparently, after delivery to Belgium, the plane had been leased or sold to Affretair. The aircraft had also reportedly been registered by the Government of Gabon.

(e) Air Rhodesia and IATA agreements (Case No. INGO-4)

94. Case No. INGO-4, which was opened on the basis of information received from a non-governmental organization to the effect that interline traffic and cargo agreements between various international carriers and Air Rhodesia existed, was reviewed in paragraphs 155 to 158 of the seventh report. Since then, additional written replies have been received from 15 Governments and two replies have been made in the Committee, all stating that the Governments concerned had ensured that no airline company under their jurisdiction maintained any link with Air Rhodesia.

(f) Package tours to Southern Rhodesia and landing rights to airlines flying to Salisbury (Case No. INGO-10)

95. Case No. INGO-10 which was opened during the period under review and is also dealt with in chapter VI (see para. 117 below) in connexion with tourism should also be referred to in the present chapter in connexion with the question of the granting of landing rights in London and Paris to South African Airways flights with stopovers at Salisbury. The Committee, taking note of the divergent views on the matter expressed by its members as to whether the granting of landing rights in those conditions constituted a sanctions violation, decided to consider the question in connexion with the expansion of sanctions, on which it was preparing a special report.

Chapter VI

IMMIGRATION AND TOURISM

A. General information

96. As stated in chapter VI of the seventh report, immigration and tourism have always been considered by the illegal régime to be of particular significance both as a major source of foreign exchange earnings and as a barometer of confidence abroad. Therefore, in examining the statistics published by the illegal régime in that connexion, the only statistic available on the matter, the Committee considered that those figures should be taken with some reservation.

(a) Population

97. The total population of Southern Rhodesia reached approximately 6.2 million 10/ at the end of 1974. A breakdown of that figure and a comparison with the figures published for previous years, are as follows:

Table 1

POPULATION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA
(rounded figures, in thousands)

<u>Year</u> <u>(31 December)</u>	<u>Africans</u>	<u>Europeans</u>	<u>Asians</u>	<u>Coloured</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965 <u>a/</u>	4,260	210	8.0	12.6	4,490
1970	5,130	243	9.2	16.5	5,400
1971	5,310	255	9.4	17.3	5,590
1972	5,490	267	9.6	18.1	5,780
1973	5,700	271	9.7	19.0	6,000
1974	5,900	274	9.9	19.9	6,200

a/ As of 30 June 1965.

98. It appears from the figures above that between 1973 and 1974, the African population increased by 200,000 persons, and the European population by 3,000.

10/ All the figures given in the present chap. were gathered from the Monthly Digest of Statistics, August 1975, published by The Central Statistical Office, Salisbury, Rhodesia.

99. The increases from year to year of the African and European populations in recent years are as follows:

Table 2

RESPECTIVE INCREASES OF THE AFRICAN AND EUROPEAN POPULATIONS
(in thousands)

<u>Year</u> <u>(31 December)</u>	<u>Africans</u>	<u>Europeans</u>
1969-1970	+270	+ 9
1970-1971	+180	+12
1971-1972	+180	+12
1972-1973	+210	+ 4
1973-1974	+200	+ 3

(b) Immigration

100. Concerning immigration, it seems that the so-called "Rhodesia Settlers 74" campaign referred to in the seventh report of the Committee did not bring the results which had been hoped for by the illegal régime. It should be recalled that when the campaign was launched at the end of 1973 the prospective goal for 1974 was to attract 1 million white immigrants. Instead, according to the figures published by the régime, the immigration in 1974 totalled 9,649 persons.

101. The trend in European immigration in recent years as it appears from official statistics is as follows:

Table 3

EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION 1970-1974

	<u>Immigrants</u>	<u>Emigrants</u>	<u>Net Migration</u>
1970	12,227	5,890	6,340
1971	14,743	5,340	9,400
1972	13,966	5,150	8,820
1973	9,433	7,750	1,680
1974	9,649	9,050	600

(c) Tourism

102. Regarding tourism, the downward trend indicated in the seventh report seems to have continued during 1974, with a total of 272,704 tourists from abroad in 1974 against 288,105 in 1973. A breakdown of these figures gives the following data and also provides the trend in recent years:

Table 4

VISITORS FROM ABROAD

	<u>In transit</u>	<u>On business</u>	<u>For education</u>	<u>On holiday</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965	103,816	25,194	5,643	208,725	343,378
1970	59,336	25,951	8,124	270,659	364,070
1971	47,208	22,146	7,175	317,381	393,910
1972	37,354	20,978	7,943	339,210	405,485
1973	15,557	21,105	7,631	243,812	288,105
1974	12,498	22,878	7,758	229,570	272,704

103. Despite the downward trend, it should be noted from the table above that the number of travellers reported as visiting Southern Rhodesia for business purposes has increased during 1974.

B. Actions taken by the Committee

(a) Issuance of a press communiqué

104. The Committee considering that the question of tourism to Southern Rhodesia was of particular importance decided to bring that matter to the attention of the public by a press communiqué and to draw again to the attention of all Member States the support which the illegal régime was still receiving in that field.

105. Accordingly, on 27 May 1975, a press communiqué was issued indicating that the Committee had received repeated information to the effect that a number of travel agencies, airline companies, car-rental firms and credit-card companies in many countries were involved in organizing and providing ancillary services for promoting tourism or facilitating travel to and from Southern Rhodesia. The Committee, pointing out that the organizing of any tourist activity to Southern Rhodesia for individuals or for groups on a package tour basis must certainly entail a transfer, directly or indirectly, of funds to Southern Rhodesia, stated that such tourist and travel activities were contrary both to the spirit and letter of Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime. The text of the relevant paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) was attached to the communiqué for ease of reference.

106. That press communiqué contained also an appeal to all Member States to institute appropriate measures that might prohibit or discourage the occurrence of such activities within their territories; and to ensure that all travel agencies, airline companies, particularly those still regrettably maintaining air links with Southern Rhodesia, car-rental firms and credit-card companies, operating within their jurisdiction, desist forthwith from organizing, promoting or providing services for travel to or from Southern Rhodesia that may be contrary to the purpose for which the Security Council established mandatory sanctions against that illegal régime.

107. Accordingly, the Committee requested the Secretary-General to transmit that appeal to all Member States requesting their comments, if any, and inquiring as to what measures they had taken or intended to take in that connexion. As yet 20 Governments have given replies to that note dispatched on 3 June 1975. 11/

(b) Cases concerning tourism

108. During the period covered by the present report, the Committee examined a number of cases related to various activities related to the field of tourism, such as the organization of package tours to southern Africa including Southern Rhodesia, the holding of an international conference in Salisbury, and franchising activities by foreign companies in connexion with hotels, car-renting, etc.

109. Detailed information on these cases may be found in annexes I and IV to the present report. Salient facts of some of the relevant cases are indicated in this section.

(i) Tour organized in Southern Rhodesia (Case No. INGO-3)

110. This case which was opened on the basis of information provided to the Committee by a non-governmental organization was already referred to in paragraph 173 of the seventh report. Since then, the Government concerned (Finland) informed the Committee that in that tour to Africa which included a visit to Victoria Falls, the flight from Blantyre (Malawi) to Salisbury and the return flight to Capetown (South Africa) had taken place aboard Air Rhodesia planes. As for the flight reservations and relevant payments, they had been made by the Finnish organizers of the tour to airline companies and travel agencies representing third countries, and not to Southern Rhodesian companies. Consequently, the Chancellor of Justice, the supreme prosecuting authority in Finland, had stated that although the trip and the procedure followed might be liable to criticism, no legal grounds existed in Finland to bring the matter before the Court. The reply included assurances that no similar tours had been organized from Finland subsequently.

(ii) Tourist agencies and Southern Rhodesia (Case No. 190)

111. In this case already referred to in paragraphs 174 to 178 of the seventh report, the Committee received additional replies from the Governments concerned on the circumstances in which travel agents of their citizenship had attended a conference in Southern Rhodesia. The Government of Israel expressed regrets for it and indicated that any reoccurrence would be prevented. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that that conference was a regular

11/ Afghanistan, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, India, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Rwanda, Singapore, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Zaire.

meeting arranged by the Association of South African Travel Agents and did not involve financial arrangements that might have violated the sanctions provisions. This was also the view expressed by the Government of Sweden after having referred the matter to the Chief Public Prosecutor. The Government of the Netherlands indicated that it had pointed out to the management of the Royal Dutch Airlines (KLM) which had been represented to that conference that it considered the attendance at that meeting as a violation of the spirit of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

(iii) Franchising activities, Holiday Inn, Inc., and car-rental activities (Case No. 194)

112. This case was reported in paragraphs 179 to 185 of the seventh report. Since then, the representative of the United States informed the Committee that the United States-related franchises in Southern Rhodesia, namely Holiday Inn, Hertz, Avis, were not subsidiaries of the parent United States companies but were franchised from wholly owned South African companies. A transfer of goods and services from the United States to Southern Rhodesian franchises was prohibited and no reservations could be made through or by United States companies to those subsidiaries.

113. The Committee, considering that the question of franchises and trade names was of particular importance, decided to include it for discussion as a possible item in connexion with the expansion of sanctions on which a special report has been submitted (S/11913).

(iv) Publication of a tourist guide to Southern Rhodesia (Case No. 200)

114. The Committee opened Case No. 200 on the basis of information from published sources to the effect that a booklet designed to encourage tourism to Southern Rhodesia was published in the Federal Republic of Germany at the end of 1974. According to the information, hundreds of booklet copies were being sold and given away throughout the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria. The information was transmitted to these two Member States.

115. In its reply, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany reported that the Special Committee for the Supervision of Sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, established by the Federal Government, had examined the above-mentioned booklet Reiseführer Rhodesien. The note stated that the Federal Government was in no position to suppress the publication as the freedom of speech and information is granted by the national Constitution.

(v) Tourism and travel to and from Southern Rhodesia (Case No. INGO-7)

116. The Committee also received a communication from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions in Bonn (Federal Republic of Germany) containing information to the effect that tours in Africa including Southern Rhodesia were marketed in the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries of the European

Economic Community. Arrangements covering these package tours included sectors flown on Air Rhodesia planes. Guided sight-seeing tours and safaris inside Southern Rhodesia were handled by local travel agents. Southern Rhodesian travel agencies were using their partners in South Africa to settle all preparations for these package tours. It is on the basis of this information among others that the Committee decided to issue the press communiqué of 27 May 1975 and to request the Secretary-General to send to Member States the note dated 3 June 1975 (see paras. 104 to 107 above).

(vi) Package tours to Southern Rhodesia and landing rights to airlines flying to Salisbury (Case No. INGO-10)

117. The Committee received information from a private source to the effect that travel companies in Belgium, the United Kingdom and the United States of America co-operated with Air Rhodesia in arranging package tours to Southern Rhodesia. The delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States stated that the matter would be investigated. The Committee decided to send a note to the Government of Belgium. Moreover, as indicated in paragraph 94 above, it was stated also that France and the United Kingdom granted landing rights to South African Airways flights with stopovers at Salisbury. The delegations of France and the United Kingdom stated that the matter would be investigated and that the Committee would be kept informed.

Annexes

EXPLANATORY NOTE

General information on the cases

1. The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh reports of the Committee to the Security Council contained texts of reports and substantive parts of correspondence with Governments on 237 cases concerning suspected violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Those reports were published as follows:

- First report: Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1968, document S/8954, paragraph 9
- Second report: Ibid., Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1969, document S/9252/Add.1, annex XI
- Third report: Ibid., Twenty-fifth Year, Special Supplement No. 3 (S/9844/Rev.1), annex VII
- Fourth report: Ibid., Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2), annexes I-III
- Fifth report: Ibid., Twenty-seventh Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/10852/Rev.1), annexes I-III
- Sixth report: Ibid., Twenty-ninth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/11178/Rev.1), annexes I-IV
- Seventh report: Ibid., Thirtieth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/11594/Rev.1), annexes II-V

2. Annexes II to V to the present report contain additional information received by the Committee on 51 of the cases previously reported, together with the texts of reports and substantive parts of correspondence with Governments received up to and including 15 December 1975 concerning 49 new cases brought to the Committee's attention since submission of the seventh report. The 49 new cases include 6 cases opened from information supplied by the United States in its quarterly reports to the Committee and 6 cases opened from information supplied by individuals and non-governmental organizations.

3. As indicated in the seventh report, five cases of suspected violation of sanctions were closed during 1974 and, consequently, have been dropped from the list of cases currently under consideration given below. Those cases were:

- Case No. 127 Eastern Trading Company (Pty), Ltd.
- Case No. 146 Tobacco - "Mercury Bay"

Case No. 160 Southern Rhodesia and the World Yachting Championships, Imperia, Italy

Case No. USI-23 "Safina E. Najam": Pakistan

Case No. INGO-1 Southern Rhodesia and the World Ploughing Championships

4. As of 15 December 1975, the cumulative number of cases on the Committee's list had reached 286. However, excluding the two reclassifications mentioned in the seventh report, the five cases closed in 1974, the four cases closed in 1973 and the eight cases closed in 1972, the number of cases which were under consideration by the Committee during 1975 totals 267.

Procedural practices of the Committee

5. In the course of the implementation of its mandate, the Committee has at various times adopted procedural measures aimed at conducting its inquiries and handling its correspondence with Governments, individuals and non-governmental organizations with greater dispatch and efficiency. Those procedures, which are sometimes referred to in annexes II, III, IV and V of the present report, were described previously (see, in particular, S/11178/Rev.1, paras. 139-141, and S/11594/Rev.1, paras. 8-13 and 104).

6. Since then, the Committee decided at its 242nd meeting that a third reminder should henceforth be sent to Governments that failed to reply to its inquiries despite the fact that two reminders had been sent to them (see para. 14 above). At its 244th meeting, the Committee also decided that the no-objection procedure, by which the Secretariat was instructed to circulate to the Committee members draft notes for possible dispatch, should be extended to information concerning sports events gathered from published sources.

7. Finally, it may be recalled that when the Committee appears to have exhausted its inquiries without being able to resolve the matter, it may decide to send a standard note to all or any of the Governments concerned in the case from which no further replies are pending. The note includes the following paragraph:

"The Committee is not satisfied on the basis of the information in its possession that there has not been a breach of sanctions. The Committee hopes that the Government of _____ will pursue the matter further and inform it immediately of any further information that may come to light. Meanwhile, the Committee has decided to place in its permanent records the fact that insufficient information has been received to date to enable it to dispose of the case in a conclusive manner."

COMPLETE LIST OF CASES CURRENTLY UNDER CONSIDERATION

(In conformity with the usual practice, it has been considered useful to arrange all the cases according to the commodities involved. Thus, in addition to the case number which follows the chronological order of the date of its receipt by the Committee, the cases have also been serially numbered for easy reference.)

A. METALLIC ORES, METALS AND THEIR ALLOYS

Ferrochrome and chrome ores

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(1)	1	Chrome sand - " <u>Tjibodas</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 20 December 1968
(2)	3	Chrome sand - " <u>Tjipondok</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1969
(3)	5	Trade in chrome ore and ferrochrome: United Kingdom note dated 6 February 1969
(4)	6	Ferrochrome - " <u>Blue Sky</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 12 February 1969
(5)	7	Ferrochrome - " <u>Catharina Oldendorff</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 22 February 1969
(6)	11	Ferrochrome - " <u>Al Mubarakiah</u> " and " <u>Al Sabahiah</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1969
(7)	17	Ferrochrome - " <u>Gasikara</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 19 June 1969
(8)	23	Ferrochrome - " <u>Massimoemee</u> " and " <u>Archon</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1969
(9)	25	Ferrochrome - " <u>Batu</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969
(10)	31	Chrome ore and ferrochrome - " <u>Ville de Nantes</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969
(11)	36	Ferrochrome - " <u>Ioannis</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(12)	37	Ferrochrome - " <u>Halleren</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(13)	40	Ferrochrome - " <u>Ville de Reims</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 29 August 1969
(14)	45	Ferrochrome - " <u>Tai Sun</u> " and " <u>Kyotai Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 20 September 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(15)	55	Ferrochrome - " <u>Guvnor</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 10 November 1969
(16)	57	Chrome ore - " <u>Myrtidiotissa</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 17 November 1969
(17)	59	Shipments of ferrochrome to various countries: United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969
(18)	64	Chrome ore and ferrochrome - " <u>Birte Oldendorff</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969
(19)	71	Ferrochrome - " <u>Disa</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 2 April 1970
(20)	73	Chrome ore - " <u>Selene</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 April 1970
(21)	74	Chrome ores and concentrates - " <u>Castasegna</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 17 April 1970
(22)	76	Ferrochrome - " <u>Hodakasan Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1970
(23)	79	Chrome ore - " <u>Schutting</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1970
(24)	80	Chrome ore - " <u>Klostertor</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 10 June 1970
(25)	89	Chrome ore - " <u>Ville du Havre</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 18 August 1970
(26)	95	Ferrochrome and ferrosilicon - " <u>Trautenfels</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 11 September 1970
(27)	100	Chrome - " <u>Cuxhaven</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 16 October 1970
(28)	103	Chrome ore - " <u>Anna Presthus</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 October 1970
(29)	108	Minerals - " <u>Schonfels</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
(30)	110	Chrome ores - " <u>Kybfels</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 January 1971

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(31)	116	Chrome ores and concentrates - " <u>Rotenfels</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 31 March 1971
(32)	130	Chrome ore - " <u>Agios Georgios</u> ": Information supplied by Somalia on 27 March 1972
(33)	135	Chrome ore - " <u>Santos Vega</u> ": Information supplied by Somalia on 20 March 1972
(34)	153	Ferrochrome - " <u>Itaimbe</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 August 1973
(35)	165	Chrome ore - " <u>Gemstone</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 5 February 1974
(36)	212	Ferrochrome - " <u>Gerd Wesch</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 9 July 1975
<u>Silicon</u>		
(37)	178	Silicon-chrome - " <u>Tsedek</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 7 June 1974
(38)	179	Silicon metal - " <u>Atlantic Fury</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 18 June 1974
<u>Ferro-manganese</u>		
(39)	185	Ferro-manganese - " <u>Straat Nagasaki</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1974
<u>Tungsten ore</u>		
(40)	78	Tungsten ore - " <u>Tenko Maru</u> " and " <u>Suruga Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 28 May 1970
<u>Copper</u>		
(41)	12	Copper concentrates - " <u>Tjipondok</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 12 May 1969
(42)	15	Copper concentrates - " <u>Eizan Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 4 June 1969
(43)	34	Copper exports: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(44)	51	Copper concentrates - " <u>Straat Futami</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 8 October 1969
(45)	99	Copper - various ships: United Kingdom note dated 9 October 1970
<u>Nickel</u>		
(46)	102	Nickel - " <u>Randfontein</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 28 October 1970
(47)	109	Nickel - " <u>Sloterkerk</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 11 January 1971
(48)	118	Nickel - " <u>Serooskerk</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 6 May 1971
(49)	184	Nickel - " <u>Kungshamn</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 2 July 1974
(50)	193	Electrolytic nickel cathodes - " <u>Pleias</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 22 October 1974
<u>Lithium ores</u>		
(51)	20	Petalite - " <u>Sado Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 June 1969
(52)	24	Petalite - " <u>Abbekerk</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 12 July 1969
(53)	30	Petalite - " <u>Simonskerk</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969
(54)	32	Petalite - " <u>Yang Tse</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 6 August 1969
(55)	46	Petalite - " <u>Kyotai Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969
(56)	54	Lepidolite - " <u>Ango</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 October 1969
(57)	86	Petalite ore - " <u>Krugerland</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1970

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(58)	107	Tantalite - " <u>Table Bay</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
(59)	151	Petalite - " <u>Merrimac</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 July 1973

Pig-iron and steel billets

(60)	29	Pig-iron - " <u>Mare Piceno</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1969
(61)	70	Steel billets: United Kingdom note dated 16 February 1970
(62)	85	Steel billets - " <u>Despinan</u> " and " <u>Birooni</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 July 1970
(63)	114	Steel products - " <u>Gemini Exporter</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 3 February 1971
(64)	137	Steel billets - " <u>Malaysia Fortune</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972
(65)	138	Steel billets - " <u>Aliakmon Pilot</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972
(66)	140	Steel billets and maize - " <u>Char Hwa</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 9 April 1973

Graphite

(67)	38	Graphite - " <u>Kaapland</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(68)	43	Graphite - " <u>Tanga</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
(69)	62	Graphite - " <u>Transvaal</u> ", " <u>Kaapland</u> ", " <u>Stellenbosch</u> " and " <u>Swellendam</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 22 December 1969

B. MINERAL FUELS

(70)	172	Crude oil: United Kingdom note dated 7 May 1974
(71)	187	Crushed coking coal: United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1974

C. TOBACCO

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(72)	4	Tobacco - " <u>Mokaria</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 January 1969
(73)	10	Tobacco - " <u>Mohasi</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 29 March 1969
(74)	19	Tobacco - " <u>Goodwill</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 25 June 1969
(75)	26	Transactions in Southern Rhodesian tobacco: United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969
(76)	35	Tobacco - " <u>Montaigle</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969
(77)	82	Tobacco - " <u>Elias L</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1970
(78)	92	Cigarettes believed to be manufactured in Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970
(79)	98	Tobacco - " <u>Hellenic Beach</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1970
(80)	104	Tobacco - " <u>Agios Nicolaos</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970
(81)	105	Tobacco - " <u>Montalto</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970
(82)	149	Tobacco - " <u>Straat Holland</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 19 July 1973
(83)	156	Tobacco - " <u>Hellenic Glory</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 4 October 1973
(84)	157	Tobacco - " <u>Oranjeland</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 9 October 1973
(85)	164	Tobacco - " <u>Mexico Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 January 1974
(86)	169	Tobacco - " <u>Adelaide Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 5 April 1974
(87)	196	Tobacco - " <u>Streefkerk</u> " and " <u>Swellendam</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 5 December 1974

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(88)	202	Tobacco - " <u>M. Drammensfiord</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 6 March 1975
(89)	207	Imports of tobacco by Belgian firm: United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1975
		D. CEREALS
(90)	18	Trade in maize: United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1969
(91)	39	Maize - " <u>Fraternity</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(92)	44	Maize - " <u>Galini</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
(93)	47	Maize - " <u>Santa Alexandra</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969
(94)	49	Maize - " <u>Zeno</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 26 September 1969
(95)	56	Maize - " <u>Julia L.</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 November 1969
(96)	63	Maize - " <u>Polyxene C.</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969
(97)	90	Maize - " <u>Virgy</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970
(98)	91	Maize - " <u>Master Daskalos</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970
(99)	97	Maize - " <u>Lambros M. Fatsis</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 September 1970
(100)	106	Maize - " <u>Corviglia</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
(101)	124	Maize - " <u>Armonía</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971
(102)	125	Maize - " <u>Alexandros S</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 23 September 1971
(103)	139	Maize - " <u>Pythia</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 6 April 1973

E. COTTON AND COTTON SEEDS

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(104)	53	Cotton seed - " <u>Holly Trader</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 23 October 1969
(105)	96	Cotton - " <u>S. A. Statesman</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 14 September 1970
F. MEAT		
(106)	8	Meat - " <u>Kaapland</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 10 March 1969
(107)	13	Meat - " <u>Zuiderkerk</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1969
(108)	14	Beef - " <u>Tabora</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1969
(109)	16	Beef - " <u>Tugelaland</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 16 June 1969
(110)	22	Beef - " <u>Swellendam</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1969
(111)	33	Meat - " <u>Taveta</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 8 August 1969
(112)	42	Meat - " <u>Polana</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 17 September 1969
(113)	61	Chilled meat: United Kingdom note dated 8 December 1969
(114)	68	Pork - " <u>Alcor</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970
(115)	117	Frozen meat - " <u>Drymakos</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 21 April 1971
(116)	183	Trade in meat and banking facilities: United Kingdom note dated 25 June 1974

G. SUGAR

(117)	28	Sugar - " <u>Byzantine Monarch</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 21 July 1969
-------	----	---

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(118)	60	Sugar - " <u>Filotis</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969
(119)	65	Sugar - " <u>Eleni</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 5 January 1970
(120)	72	Sugar - " <u>Lavrentios</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 8 April 1970
(121)	83	Sugar - " <u>Angelia</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1970
(122)	94	Sugar - " <u>Philomila</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 28 August 1970
(123)	112	Sugar - " <u>Evangelos M</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1971
(124)	115	Sugar - " <u>Aegean Mariner</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 19 March 1971
(125)	119	Sugar - " <u>Calli</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 10 May 1971
(126)	122	Sugar - " <u>Netanya</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1971
(127)	126	Sugar - " <u>Netanya</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1971
(128)	128	Sugar - " <u>Netanya</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 11 February 1972
(129)	131	Sugar - " <u>Mariner</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 12 April 1972
(130)	132	Sugar - " <u>Primrose</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1972
(131)	147	Sugar - " <u>Anangel Ambition</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 27 June 1973
H. FERTILIZERS AND AMMONIA		
(132)	2	Import of manufactured fertilizers from Europe: United Kingdom note dated 14 January 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(133)	48	Ammonia - " <u>Butaneuve</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969
(134)	52	Bulk ammonia: United Kingdom notes dated 15 October and 10 November 1969
(135)	66	Ammonia - " <u>Cérons</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 7 January 1970
(136)	69	Ammonia - " <u>Mariotte</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970
(137)	101	Anhydrous ammonia: United States note dated 12 October 1970
(138)	113	Anhydrous ammonia - " <u>Cypress</u> " and " <u>Isfönn</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 29 January 1971
(139)	123	Anhydrous ammonia - " <u>Znon</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971
(140)	129	Anhydrous ammonia - " <u>Kristian Birkeland</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 February 1972
(141)	204	Import of agricultural crop chemicals into Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 13 March 1975
I. MACHINERY		
(142)	50	Tractor kits: United Kingdom note dated 2 October 1969
(143)	58	Book-keeping and accounting machines: Italian note dated 6 November 1969
(144)	161	Electric generating equipment: United Kingdom note dated 3 December 1973
(145)	170	Spare parts for sewing or knitting machines: United Kingdom note dated 10 April 1974
(146)	177	Machine tools: United Kingdom note dated 4 June 1974

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(147)	189	Wankie power station: United Kingdom note dated 9 September 1974
(148)	209	Rolling mill rolls: United Kingdom note dated 6 June 1975
(149)	221	Supply of electrical equipment: United Kingdom note dated 1 September 1975

J. TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT

Motor vehicles and/or motor-vehicle spares

(150)	9	Motor vehicles: United States note dated 28 March 1969
(151)	145	Trucks, engines etc.: Information obtained by the Committee from published sources
(152)	168	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - " <u>Straat Rio</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 15 March 1974
(153)	173	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - " <u>Daphne</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 16 May 1974
(154)	180	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - " <u>Straat Rio</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1974
(155)	182	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - " <u>M. Citadel</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1974
(156)	195	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - " <u>Soula K</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1974
(157)	197	Trade in motor vehicles (and other commodities): United Kingdom note dated 6 December 1974

Aircraft and/or aircraft spares

(158)	41	Aircraft spares: United Kingdom note dated 5 September 1969
(159)	67	Supply of aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 January 1970
(160)	144	Sale of three Boeing aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(161)	162	Viscount aircraft: United Kingdom note dated 17 January 1974
(162)	206	Jet fighters and other military equipment: Information obtained from published sources
(163)	232	Acquisition of DC-8 aircraft by Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1975
<u>Others</u>		
(164)	88	Cycle accessories: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1970
(165)	141	Locomotives - " <u>Beira</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1973
K. TEXTILE FABRICS AND RELATED PRODUCTS		
(166)	93	Shirts manufactured in Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970
(167)	150	Cotton corduroy - " <u>Straat Nagasaki</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 23 June 1973
(168)	152	Textiles - " <u>Ise Maru</u> " and " <u>Acapulco Maru</u> ": United Kingdom note dated 7 August 1973
L. SPORTING ACTIVITIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIONS		
(169)	120	Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games: Note from the Federal Republic of Germany dated 5 April 1971
(170)	148	Southern Rhodesia and the Maccabiah Games: Information supplied to the Committee by the Sudan on 21 June 1973
(171)	166	Southern Rhodesia and the International Judo Federation: Information obtained from published sources
(172)	167	Tour of a Southern Rhodesian cricket player abroad: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(173)	174	Hockey team on tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(174)	175	Yachting coach on tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(175)	181	Southern Rhodesia and the Federation of International Football Associations (FIFA): Information obtained from published sources
(176)	186	Southern Rhodesia and the International Chess Federation (FIDE): Information obtained from published sources
(177)	191	New Zealand cricket club tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(178)	192	Hockey club on tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(179)	198	Southern Rhodesia and the golf championships in Colombia: Information obtained from published sources
(180)	199	Southern Rhodesia and the golf championships in the Dominican Republic: Information obtained from published sources
(181)	205	Irish rugby team tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(182)	211	Tour of certain European countries by Southern Rhodesian hockey club: Information obtained from published sources
(183)	215	Southern Rhodesia and the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGS): Information obtained from published sources
(184)	216	United States basketball coach tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(185)	217	Visit to Southern Rhodesia by Argentinian hockey umpire: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(186)	219	Southern Rhodesia and the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF): Information obtained from published sources
(187)	220	Southern Rhodesia and the International Amateur Swimming Federation (FINA): Information obtained from published sources
(188)	222	Participation of Southern Rhodesian yachtsmen in the World Fireball regatta in France: Information obtained from published sources
(189)	223	International squash tournament in Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(190)	224	Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the World Ploughing Match in Canada: Information obtained from published sources
(191)	225	Visit of English polo team to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(192)	226	International Wanderers cricket team visit to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(193)	228	Visit of Southern Rhodesian karate coach to France: Information obtained from published sources
(194)	229	Participation of Southern Rhodesian player in the international tennis championships in Spain: Information obtained from published sources
(195)	230	Participation of Southern Rhodesian in the commemorative marathon in Greece: Information obtained from published sources
(196)	231	Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the Dewar Tennis Cup matches: Information obtained from published sources
(197)	234	Visit of the American All-Stars College Basketball Team to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources

M. BANKING, INSURANCE AND OTHER RELATED FACILITIES

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(198)	163	Swiss company loan to Rhodesia Railways: United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1974
(199)	171	Rhodesia Iron and Steel Corporation (RISCO): Information obtained from published sources
(200)	176	New Zealand insurance companies: Information obtained from published sources
(201)	203	Payment by Southern Rhodesian bank to Austrian company: United Kingdom note dated 7 March 1975
(202)	208	Financial loan to a Southern Rhodesian company: United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1975

N. TOURISM AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

(203)	143	Southern Rhodesian representational offices abroad: (a) Rhodesia National Tourist Board: Basel, Switzerland; (b) Rhodesian information centre and Air Rhodesia office, Sydney, Australia; (c) Rhodesia information office, Washington, D.C., USA, and Rhodesia tourist and Air Rhodesia offices, New York, USA; (d) Rhodesia Information Office, Paris, France: Information obtained from published sources and from non-governmental sources.
(204)	190	Tourism agencies and Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(205)	194	Holiday Inns and car-rentals: Information obtained from published sources
(206)	200	Publication of a tourist guide to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(207)	213	Flights to and from Southern Rhodesia: Case opened at the 243rd meeting
(208)	227	Organized tours abroad for persons using Southern Rhodesian passports: Information obtained from published sources

O. OTHER CASES

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(209)	133	Supply of medical equipment to the University of Southern Rhodesia: Swedish note dated 7 June 1972
(210)	154	<u>"Tango Romeo"</u> - Sanctions-breaking activities via Gabon: Information obtained from published sources and supplied to the Committee by the United Kingdom on 30 August 1973
(211)	155	Cameras from Switzerland: United Kingdom note dated 27 September 1973
(212)	158	Pine oil from the United States - <u>"Charlotte Lykes"</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 October 1973
(213)	159	Cardboard containers from Spain: United Kingdom note dated 12 November 1973
(214)	201	Danish trade with Southern Rhodesia: Information supplied by Denmark
(215)	210	Supply of various items of miscellaneous equipment to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1975
(216)	214	Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources submitted by Switzerland
(217)	218	Southern Rhodesia and the International Chamber of Commerce: Information obtained from published sources
(218)	233	Supply of chemical substances to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 1 December 1975

P. IMPORT OF CHROME, NICKEL AND OTHER MATERIALS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA INTO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (ship and country of registration)

Case No.

USI-1	<u>"La Chacra"</u> : United Kingdom
USI-2	<u>"Treutenfels"</u> : Federal Republic of Germany
USI-3	<u>"Bris"</u> : Norway

Case No.

USI-4 "African Sun", "Moormacove", "Moormacargo", "African Moon", "African Lightning", "Moormacbay", "African Mercury", "African Dawn" and "Moormactrade": United States

USI-5 "Hellenic Leader", "North Highness", "Venthisikimi" and "Ocean Pegasus": Greece

USI-6 "S. A. Huguenot" and "Nederburg": South Africa

USI-7 "Angelo Scinicariello" and "Alfredo Primo": Italy

USI-8 "Marne Lloyd", "Musi Lloyd" and "Merwe Lloyd": Netherlands

USI-9 "Aktion", "Pholegandros", "Mexican Gulf" and "Trade Carrier": Liberia

USI-10 "Trade Carrier": Liberia

USI-11 "Hellenic Destiny": Greece

USI-12 "Costas Frangos": Greece

USI-13 "Adelfoi": Liberia

USI-14 "Costas Frangos" and "Nortrans Unity": Greece

USI-15 "Weltevreden": South Africa

USI-16 "Steinfels": Federal Republic of Germany

USI-17 "Nedlloyd Kingston": Netherlands

USI-19 "Nedlloyd Kembla": Netherlands

USI-20 "Morganstar": South Africa

USI-21 "Hellenic Destiny", "Ocean Pegasus", "Venthisikimi", "Costas Frangos" and "Nortrans Unity": Greece

USI-22 "Sun River": Norway

USI-24 "Wildenfels" and "Steinfels": Federal Republic of Germany

USI-25 "Hellenic Destiny": Greece

USI-26 "Weser Express": Federal Republic of Germany

USI-27 "Stockenfels": Federal Republic of Germany

Case No.

USI-28 "S. A. Huguenot": South Africa
USI-29 "Hellenic Laurel": Greece
USI-30 "Nedlloyd Kimberly": Netherlands
USI-31 "Nedlloyd Kembla": Netherlands
USI-32 "Hellenic Carrier": Greece
USI-33 "Nedlloyd Kyoto": Netherlands
USI-34 "Diana Skou": Denmark
USI-35 "Hellenic Sun": Greece
USI-36 "New England Trapper": Liberia
USI-37 "Ogden Sacramento": Panama
USI-38 "Ascendant": Panama
USI-39 "Safina-E-Rehmet": Pakistan
USI-40 "Nedlloyd Kingston": Netherlands

Q. CASES OPENED FROM INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY INDIVIDUALS
AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

INGO-2 Joba/Etb. Zephyr Co., Amsterdam:
Information supplied by the Anti-Apartheids Beweging Nederland,
Amsterdam, Netherlands

INGO-3 Tour of certain African countries, including Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the Mouvement pour la défense de la paix
en Finlande

INGO-4 Air Rhodesia and IATA Agreements:
Information supplied by the Center for Social Action of the
United Church of Christ, New York, United States of America

INGO-5 Ferrochrome:
Information obtained from non-governmental sources

INGO-6 Tobacco:
Report submitted by the Anti-Apartheids Beweging Nederland,
Amsterdam, Netherlands

Case No.

- INGO-7 Tourism and travel to and from Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the Research Group for Interparliamentary
Questions, Bonn, the Federal Republic of Germany
- INGO-8 Tourism, immigration and transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the National Anti-Apartheid Committee
(NAAC) of New Zealand
- INGO-9 Cargo Air Transport (CAT);
Information supplied by the Comité contre le colonialisme et
l'apartheid, Brussels, Belgium
- INGO-10 Package tours to Southern Rhodesia and landing rights to airlines
flying to Salisbury:
Information supplied by Ms. Barbara Rogers
- INGO-11 Tour to Southern Rhodesia organized by a United Kingdom travel
agency:
Information supplied by the Women's International League for
Peace, British Branch, London, United Kingdom
- INGO-12 Trading activities and other relations with Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the Mouvement contre le racisme,
l'anti-sémitisme et pour la paix, Paris, France.

Annex I

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND PROGRAMME OF WORK AND SUMMARY OF THE ENSUING DISCUSSION

1. When the Committee began consideration of its programme of work for 1975, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics suggested that the organization of work needed to be radically changed so that the Committee would not be burdened with the discussion of details and would have time to review and include in its annual report to the Security Council not only a list of the cases it had considered but the conclusions reached and the views and recommendations formulated by the Committee. His delegation wished to point out that, in accordance with the mandate the Committee had received from the Security Council, the consideration of cases was only part of the major task which the Committee was required to carry out: it should, in its work, also pay great attention to questions on a wider and more general level relating to the implementation of the sanctions and other questions relating to the realization of the right to freedom of the people of Southern Rhodesia. Accordingly, the Committee's work should be reorganized so as to concentrate on the key questions, that is (a) overt violations of sanctions; (b) the list of countries to which 20 or more notes concerning violations of sanctions had been sent; (c) the foreign companies most often named in the work of the Committee as well as the foreign companies operating in the territory of Southern Rhodesia; (d) the expansion of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; (e) the extension of the sanctions to South Africa; and (f) the information provided by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in accordance with Security Council resolution 253 (1968), paragraph 21, and resolution 277 (1970), paragraphs 21 and 22. The Secretariat should prepare factual information regarding those questions which should be included in the Committee's programme of work. In particular, a summary of overt violations of sanctions by the United States could be prepared, as well as a list of the countries to which the Secretary-General had sent 20 or more queries in connexion with suspected violations of sanctions and a list of the foreign companies most frequently named in connexion with cases of suspected sanctions violations, together with another list of the foreign companies operating in Southern Rhodesia. The Committee should also take up the questions of expanding sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, of extending them to South Africa, and of discharging its wider mandate designed to achieve freedom and independence for the people of Zimbabwe. He suggested also that the co-operation between the Committee and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which dealt with many of the subjects with which the Committee itself was concerned, including the activities of foreign companies in Southern Rhodesia, should be continued and expanded.

2. The representative of the Soviet Union also wondered when the information which the Committee was entitled to receive from the United Kingdom in accordance with paragraph 21 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and paragraphs 21

and 22 of Security Council resolution 277 (1970) could be expected. Moreover, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the United Kingdom had been called upon to take all possible measures to put an end to political repression, including arrests, detentions, trials and executions which violated fundamental freedoms and rights of the people of Southern Rhodesia. Information was needed on those matters as well as on the measures taken by the United Kingdom, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 277 (1970) and paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 288 (1970). The Committee was also entitled to receive information on measures taken by the United Kingdom, pursuant to paragraph 17 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), to ensure a settlement that would take into account the views of the people of Southern Rhodesia, in particular those of the political parties advocating majority rule, and that such settlement was acceptable to the people of Southern Rhodesia as a whole. The question of the information to be provided by the United Kingdom had been raised by his delegation over a year ago; thus far, that information had not been received and the spirit and letter of the relevant Security Council resolutions had therefore been violated. With regard to the consideration of cases, a working group of the Committee, consisting of non-permanent members of the Security Council, should be established to deal with individual cases and to make proposals to the Committee.

3. The representative of Iraq supported the Soviet proposals, in particular, those relating to the overt sanctions violations and to the foreign companies. He proposed the following items for inclusion in the Committee's programme of work: (a) a decision by the Committee to meet regularly every week; (b) activities of foreign companies in Southern Rhodesia; (c) insurance of goods and passengers going to or from Southern Rhodesia; (d) immigration, tourism and sporting activities in connexion with Southern Rhodesia; (e) the question of sending notes of inquiry to and receiving written replies from Governments represented on the Committee; (f) the question of the Committee's relationship with the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

4. He pointed out that the question of foreign companies in Southern Rhodesia deserved special consideration in view of the importance of such foreign interests to the Rhodesian economy. He therefore supported the proposal that the Secretariat should bring up to date the list of such companies; that the list should be made public through all possible channels of communications and brought to the attention of African Governments, through OAU. He also suggested that the question of insurance should be considered again in depth, as well as the questions of immigration, tourism and sporting activities. Regarding sporting activities, the Secretariat should be authorized to prepare notes on sporting events involving Southern Rhodesia and to circulate them with "no-objection" slips. With regard to the sending of notes to, and the receipt of written replies from, members of the Committee, his delegation held that the members of the Committee should no longer be given favoured treatment in that regard. As to the question of the Committee's relations with OAU, his delegation proposed that observer status in the Committee should be granted to a representative of that organization. More publicity should

be given to the work of the Committee, and, to that end, the Chairman should hold periodic press conferences. Also, closer contacts and exchanges of information should be promoted with non-governmental organizations concerned with the situation in Southern Rhodesia. With regard to the division of the Committee's work, he suggested that the Committee should devote some meetings to the consideration of specific cases and others to general topics relating to violations of sanctions. The representative of Iraq also requested the Secretariat to prepare a list of recommendations, decisions and suggestions made by the Committee as a whole during 1973 and 1974 and asked that such a list should be brought up to date on a regular quarterly basis, so that it could serve as reference material for members of the Committee.

5. The representative of Japan stated that simultaneous and unremitting pressure from inside and outside Southern Rhodesia to bring about a just and satisfactory settlement constituted the best hope for the early success of the Committee. He observed that recent events encouraged his delegation to believe that victory in the long struggle against racial discrimination in Southern Rhodesia was not too far distant. He drew attention to certain press reports which had been circulated in 1974 alleging that some Japanese companies had been evading sanctions. He offered firm assurances that the Government of Japan had strictly enforced the sanctions required by United Nations resolutions and that it had neither trade nor any other relations with the illegal régime in Salisbury. He stated that violators would be liable to administrative disciplinary action and criminal punishment. He could not agree to the proposal that a list of countries to which the Secretary-General had sent 20 or more notes concerning suspected violations of sanctions should be issued. He stated that the primary objective of notes was to seek information on suspected cases of violations. The mere fact that some Member States received such notes should not be interpreted as implying that they had been involved in violation of sanctions. He stressed the importance of wording all notes sent from the Secretary-General to Governments in a manner which could not be construed as accusatory. He stated that such a list would be meaningless and the figure 20 was an arbitrary number. It would be more useful, for the consideration of follow-up measures, to establish an up-to-date list of countries whose co-operation had been solicited but which had not responded or did not provide satisfactory replies to the Committee's inquiries. The representative of Japan could not agree to the proposal that the Committee should at the current stage be divided into working groups. He stated that the Committee as a whole had a joint responsibility in regard to the implementation of Security Council resolutions and found no reasons to support the proposal. With regard to the proposal of press interviews or press conferences by the Chairman, he stated that they were necessary to inform the public and non-members of the Committee of its work. In that connexion, he suggested that the Committee might consider the possibility of holding occasional public meetings in order to secure closer co-operation with delegations which were not members of the Committee. As regards the allocation of meetings, his delegation was prepared to agree with the wishes of the majority of the Committee, but that, whatever the ratio adopted, the Committee should proceed in a flexible manner. If many cases were still pending at the time of preparation of the annual report, more time should be devoted to the consideration of specific cases.

6. The representative of Sweden stated that the possibilities for new developments in the area did not justify a wait-and-see attitude as far as the work of the Committee was concerned. On the contrary, the Committee should seek to enhance the effectiveness of sanctions supervision in order to increase the pressure on the illegal régime. By faithfully implementing the rules, he said, the world Organization and its membership could show its determination to contribute to speeding up the process towards self-determination of the majority of the people of Zimbabwe. Noting that a special law on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia had been promulgated by Sweden in 1969 and was being faithfully enforced, he stated that Sweden would favourably study proposals aiming at extending the system of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, especially since the list of examples in Article 41 of the Charter had not yet been exhausted by decisions of the Security Council. It was equally important, however, to ensure that measures already decided upon were implemented in an effective way. To that end he proposed that the Committee should examine the question of how older cases could be reviewed more effectively. Moreover, noting that considerable efforts had been devoted to preparation of a manual to guide the Committee, as well as Governments and governmental agencies, in handling questions of documentation concerning goods originating in southern Africa, he suggested that the Committee should consider making positive recommendations in that regard. He proposed that the Committee should continue to give attention to the problem of interline agreements between Air Rhodesia and other airlines.

7. The representative of Sweden agreed that the Committee should address itself to the question of the activities of foreign companies in Southern Rhodesia. His delegation was prepared to study questions relating to insurance, which might be taken up in the context of cases brought to the attention of the Committee. His delegation agreed that international sporting exchanges between teams or individuals from Southern Rhodesia and tourism to Southern Rhodesia were contrary to the spirit and intent of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia. The Committee would therefore be fully justified in continuing to give attention to those matters. Regarding the proposal to send notes of inquiry to the members of the Committee, he supported it on the basis that there could be no reason why members of the Committee should be treated differently from non-members as far as such notes were concerned. His delegation also believed that it was useful to expand the existing channels of information open to the Committee. He noted, however, that information regarding the recommendations, decisions and suggestions made in the Committee had already been provided in the Committee's annual reports.

8. The representative of Sweden believed that it would be appropriate for the Committee to give attention to both covert and overt violations of sanctions. Sweden, however, could not accept the notion that a mission's receipt of 20 or more notes from the Secretary-General had any special significance. His delegation, therefore, could not support the idea of publishing lists on the basis of such purely numerical considerations without regard to the actual facts in each case. The Swedish delegation could not support the proposal to set up a special working group to study cases brought to the attention of the Committee, since the Committee

already was sufficiently limited in membership to allow for effective study. Moreover, it was unlikely that any member of the Committee would accept the idea of being represented by another delegation in the essential work of studying the cases. He said that it was obvious that the Committee's mandate did not allow for an extension of sanctions to South Africa, and he felt that the appropriate forum for examining that question was the Security Council itself. Finally, he expressed the hope that the delegation of the United Kingdom would continue to provide basic information to the Committee in as much detail as possible.

9. The representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic stated that the experience of the previous year had shown that the consideration of specific cases had not led to the proper implementation of sanctions. It was because too much time had been devoted to questions of details that the Committee's last annual report to the Security Council contained no conclusions or recommendations conducive to the effective implementation of sanctions. His delegation fully supported the various proposals concerning ways in which the Committee could improve its work. Great importance should be attached to general issues. Consideration of the extension of sanctions to South Africa or of open violations of sanctions could make a much greater contribution to the Committee's work than the consideration of a vast number of cases. The Committee had not yet considered the situation with regard to countries which had received more than 20 notes from the Secretary-General, and his delegation supported the proposal that the list of such countries prepared by the Secretariat should be brought up to date for consideration by the Committee. He noted that much attention was currently being paid within the United Nations to the question of multinational corporations. The General Assembly had considered their activities in Southern Rhodesia and had indicated in several resolutions that those activities constituted a major obstacle to the implementation of the Assembly Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation disagreed with those who felt that the Committee should not consider that question or that it did not have enough data at its disposal to prepare a list of such companies operating in Southern Rhodesia. There was no reason why the Secretariat document on the subject could not be brought up to date and possibly be made more accurate so that the Committee could make recommendations on that subject to the Security Council. The Committee should also consider the question of extending sanctions to South Africa, which had already been raised in the Security Council. His delegation endorsed the proposal that the Committee should hold one or more open meetings, as well as the proposal that information received from the United Kingdom should be considered in the context of Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970). As for the establishment of a working group of non-permanent members of the Security Council to consider specific cases of suspected violations of sanctions, his delegation would support it since such a proposal would make it possible for the Committee to consider cases more effectively, accelerate its work as a whole, and give greater attention to the general questions, while leaving the final decision on those cases to the Committee.

10. The representative of China stressed the need for the strict implementation of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and for vigorous support of the just struggle of the Zimbabwe people for national liberation against the Smith racist

régime. He was in favour of the inclusion in the Committee's programme of work of an item concerning the strengthening of the implementation of sanctions and the widening of their scope and supported the proposals made by the representatives of Iraq, the United Republic of Tanzania and others in that respect. He supported the views of the African representatives that in order to make the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia effective, the sanctions should be widened to cover South Africa. He was in favour of the proposal for strengthening the Committee's relationship with OAU and for inviting the representative of OAU to participate in the Committee's discussions on specific cases, as well as on general subjects.

11. The representative of Costa Rica said that his delegation would support for inclusion in the Committee's programme of work any item which could lead to the reinforcement and broadening of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations.

12. The representative of France noted that the proposals before the Committee had already appeared in annex I to the Committee's seventh report issued at the end of 1974 (S/11594/Rev.1), because no agreement could be reached on them in the Committee at that time. He agreed with those who felt that the Committee should forthwith begin considering specific cases. Regarding the proposal that a working group of from three to five members could be set up to deal with specific cases, he noted that since the Committee comprised only 15 members, there was no need to subdivide it. In any case, the work had to be carried out by the Committee as a whole because the Committee could not delegate authority, especially in the matter of suspected violations of sanctions. Of course, the Committee could always consider setting up a working group for a given case on an ad hoc basis. With regard to the Iraqi proposal concerning the establishment of a list of the recommendations, decisions and suggestions made by the Committee in 1973 and 1974, the representative of France pointed out that most of them had been recorded in the Committee's reports to the Security Council.

13. The representative of Guyana suggested that the proposal that the Chairman should hold periodic press conferences, as well as the proposal concerning the holding of open meetings, should be further explored as a means of generating interest in the Committee's work. There appeared to be two schools of thought concerning the general approach to be taken in regard to the programme of work. In that connexion, his delegation could not accept the view that the Committee should concentrate exclusively on specific cases; the Iraqi proposal to consider specific cases and general issues at alternate meetings therefore had much merit. As a whole, indeed, the list of items proposed by the representative of Iraq deserved consideration by the Committee. He also suggested that cases of suspected violations of sanctions might also be grouped under subject headings, so that discussion thereon could give rise to the consideration of general issues.

14. The representatives of the African delegations to the Committee deplored that the sanctions had not been as effective as desired. Consequently, they supported the proposal that the Committee should urgently consider the question of expanding sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and extending them to South Africa.

They also emphasized the importance of establishing a precise framework for the activities of the Committee in order to increase its efficiency. In that connexion they considered it particularly important that the Committee should examine the question of reinforcing its working relationship with OAU.

15. The representative of Mauritania noted also that excessive importance was frequently given to economic affairs, though the moral aspect of the situation which was perpetuating itself in Southern Rhodesia was ignored. The Committee should consider with particular care the latter aspect of the question so that appropriate action could be taken. He noted that some countries were failing to live up to their responsibilities. In that connexion, he emphasized that countries which did not violate the sanctions had no reason to fear the circulation of a list of countries to which 20 or more notes concerning violations of sanctions had been sent.

16. The representative of the United Republic of Cameroon stated that the Committee should discuss any means regarding the implementation of sanctions which could bring Member States to co-operate more closely with the United Nations, in accordance with their obligation deriving from Article 25 of the Charter.

17. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania pointed out that the time had come to examine the question of expanding the scope of mandatory sanctions to include all the measures provided for in Article 41 of the Charter. In the light of the situation obtaining in Southern Rhodesia, it was of particular importance that all pressure be brought to bear against the illegal minority racist régime in Zimbabwe.

18. The representative of Italy felt that the organization of work should not give rise to such a detailed discussion. In his view, the Committee was faced with a simple problem of methodology. As a solution, he proposed that it should begin considering cases of suspected violations of sanctions at its following meeting. He emphasized that the primary concern of the Committee should be for the population of Southern Rhodesia, which was still living under the illegal minority régime. It was more important that the Committee should be successful in preventing trade with Southern Rhodesia than to spend several days discussing theoretical questions. He could not support the proposal that the Committee should set up a working group to consider cases, and he queried, furthermore, why, in order to consider cases, the working group should consist only of non-permanent members of the Security Council.

19. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that the Committee should continue to maintain as much pressure as possible on the Rhodesian régime by following the precepts of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and focusing on specific cases, primarily in the economic and commercial fields. His delegation believed that it would not be particularly useful to compile a list of the countries which had received a large number of notes in the past and, for its part, would prefer to follow up notes which had elicited either no reply or an inadequate reply. He recalled that the question of drawing up a

list of foreign companies active in Southern Rhodesia had been considered by the Committee in the past but that the list prepared had been based on inadequate, out-of-date sources. He proposed that the Secretariat should be requested to provide a definition of the term "foreign company" and to inform the Committee what sources of information were available to it. On the basis of that information, the Committee could decide whether it would be worth while drawing up a new list. Referring to the item proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union regarding the information to be provided to the Committee by the United Kingdom, he stated that his delegation had supplied in the past and would continue to supply all the information it considered relevant to the work of the Committee. His Government would not, he thought, be inclined to agree to providing large-scale political assessments of the situation in Southern Rhodesia - a question peripheral to the work of the Committee - although he would pass on a request for such information if the Committee so desired. He reiterated the position of his delegation that the Committee should concern itself primarily with cases.

20. The representative of the United States of America stated that consideration of specific sanctions violations was the Committee's primary concern. He therefore proposed that the Committee as a whole should proceed with cases and, if its work progressed too slowly, it should then consider setting up a working group. In his opinion, however, the success of any working group depended on the confidence of the members of the larger group in its viability. If the Committee could not reach a consensus on the matter, it would not be wise to set up a working group. Referring to the proposal that the Committee should consider overt violations of sanctions, he pointed out that the list of United States imports was provided voluntarily to the Committee on a regular basis and that the Committee prepared on that subject press releases which were given wide dissemination. Since there was no lack of information, voluntarily provided, relating to the matter, he wondered whether other interests might not perhaps be involved in the proposal that such cases should be discussed as a matter of priority. As to the proposal concerning the list of foreign companies operating in Southern Rhodesia, he queried how such companies could be defined and identified. In that connexion, the Committee could have received advice from the Legal Counsel. Instead, it had received purportedly up-to-date information on foreign companies in Southern Rhodesia from another source, although the author had admitted that telephone directories predating the unilateral declaration of independence had constituted on basis for the information supplied. He could not agree that that list of foreign companies operating in Southern Rhodesia should be brought up to date, because the original list had not even been a document of the Committee, and there was no agreed definition of the term "foreign company", which had been used. He inquired as to whether the Secretariat had current information on foreign investments or foreign companies in Southern Rhodesia. In connexion with the various proposals made by the representatives of Iraq and the Soviet Union, the representative of the United States observed that, except for the question of sanctions against South Africa, which was not within the Committee's competence, there was no element in them that was not covered by the specific cases which the Committee was supposed to examine. He therefore reiterated his proposal that the Committee should begin consideration

of the individual cases of suspected violations of sanctions, since in the course of doing so, it would automatically, and in a logical and sequential manner, touch upon all the subjects proposed for discussion by various members of the Committee. As for the Japanese proposal regarding a list of countries which had not responded or did not provide satisfactory replies to the Committee's inquiries, he foresaw problems in defining the term "satisfactory replies". In his delegation's view, a note of acknowledgement stating that the appropriate investigatory bodies were examining the case and that the Government concerned would report back to the Committee in due course was not an unsatisfactory reply.

21. The representative of the Soviet Union said that he could not agree with the Italian representative's view that the Committee did not need to discuss the question of methodology; he also took exception to the statement by the representative of the United States that it was not within the Committee's competence to consider a possible extension of sanctions to South Africa. Such a view was certainly not acceptable to a majority of the members of the Committee. That appeared, in particular, from the Committee's special report of 9 May 1972 (S/10632), a/ which contained a proposal by Guinea, Somalia and Sudan to the effect that the Security Council should, among other things, immediately consider the question of what action should be taken in view of the overt and constant refusal of South Africa to implement sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and to co-operate in that matter with the Security Council. That proposal had been supported by nine members of the Committee. He also disagreed with the view expressed by some members that the Committee could not delegate authority to a working group. That practice had proved to be effective in the past. He supported the Iraqi proposal that notes should be sent, whenever necessary, to all States Members of the United Nations, including members of the Committee. As for the other proposal made by Iraq to have the Secretariat prepare a list of recommendations, decisions and suggestions made in the Committee during 1973 and 1974, the representative of the Soviet Union supported it but suggested that such a list should contain all the suggestions made previously and reflect the positions of delegations in the Committee. Part of that work had already been done in the past. The Committee's reports to the Security Council contained the recommendations adopted by the Committee but did not include the many suggestions by delegations which the Committee had been unable to consider for one reason or another. As for his delegation's proposal regarding the list of countries to which 20 or more notes had been sent, such a list already existed and should be brought up to date. He pointed out that the list would be for the use of the Committee in its work and not for publication.

a/ See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1972.

Annex II

CASES CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS REPORTS AND NEW CASES

Specific cases concerning suspected violations

A. METALLIC ORES, METALS AND THEIR ALLOYS

Ferrochrome and chrome ores

- (1) Case No. 1. Chrome sand - "Tjibodas": United Kingdom note dated 20 December 1968

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the second report.

- (2) Case No. 3. Chrome sand - "Tjipondok": United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the second report.

- (3) Case No. 5. Trade in chrome ore and ferrochrome: United Kingdom note dated 6 February 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (4) Case No. 6. Ferrochrome - "Blue Sky": United Kingdom note dated 12 February 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Liberia, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.

4. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, below.

5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the seventh and eighth quarterly reports, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

- (5) Case No. 7. Ferrochrome - "Catharina Oldendorff": United Kingdom note dated 22 February 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (6) Case No. 11. Ferrochrome - "Al Mubarakiah" and "Al Sabahiah": United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (7) Case No. 17. Ferrochrome - "Gasikara": United Kingdom note dated 19 June 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

- (8) Case No. 23. Ferrochrome - "Massimoemee" and "Archon": United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the third report.

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, below.

- (9) Case No. 25. Ferrochrome - "Batu": United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

- (10) Case No. 31. Chrome ore and ferrochrome - "Ville de Nantes": United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

- (11) Case No. 36. Ferrochrome - "Ioannis": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

- (12) Case No. 37. Ferrochrome - "Hallaren": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(13) Case No. 40. Ferrochrome - "Ville de Reims": United Kingdom note dated 29 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(14) Case No. 45. Ferrochrome - "Tai Sun" and "Kyotai Maru": United Kingdom note dated 20 September 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(15) Case No. 55. Ferrochrome - "Guvnor": United Kingdom note dated 10 November 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(16) Case No. 57. Chrome ore - "Myrtidiotissa": United Kingdom note dated 17 November 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, below.

(17) Case No. 59. Shipments of ferrochrome to various countries: United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(18) Case No. 64. Chrome ore and ferrochrome - "Birte Oldendorff": United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(19) Case No. 71. Ferrochrome - "Disa": United Kingdom note dated 2 April 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(20) Case No. 73. Chrome ore - "Selene": United Kingdom note dated 13 April 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(21) Case No. 74. Chrome ore and concentrates - "Castasegna": United Kingdom note dated 17 April 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(22) Case No. 76. Ferrochrome - "Hodakasan Maru": United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(23) Case No. 79. Chrome ore - "Schutting": United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(24) Case No. 80. Chrome ore - "Klostertor": United Kingdom note dated 10 June 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(25) Case No. 89. Chrome ore - "Ville du Havre": United Kingdom note dated 18 August 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(26) Case No. 95. Ferrochrome and ferrosilicon - "Trautenfels": United Kingdom note dated 11 September 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(27) Case No. 100. Chrome - "Cuxhaven": United Kingdom note dated 16 October 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Spain the Committee decided to include that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.

4. A note dated 20 May 1975 (also covering Case No. 116) was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"With reference to Case No. 100, the Austrian firms Gebrueder Boehler and Co., A.G., and Schoeller-Bleckmann Stahlwerke, A.G., have confirmed that they have imported the amounts of 201.65 tons and 263.9 tons, respectively, of ferrochrome.

"With reference to Case No. 116, both firms have also confirmed to have imported 81.5 tons of ferrochrome, as was mentioned in the note of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Secretary-General of 20 December 1973.

"Gebrueder Boehler and Co., A.G., and Schoeller-Bleckmann Stahlwerke, A.G., added, however, that they had bought all these consignments of ferrochrome of South African origin from a European trading firm free at Austrian border. Since both firms had already bought ferrochrome from South Africa in a similar way before the imposition of sanctions, they had no reason to doubt the South African origin of the goods in these particular instances. Neither from the quality of the goods nor from documents accompanying them was it possible to suspect in any way that the goods did not originate in South Africa.

"However, both firms have pledged that they will request their suppliers to provide specific assurances for the South African origin of goods offered as originating in this country."

6. A note dated 16 June was also received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigations made by the competent Spanish authorities concerning a shipment of ferrochrome unloaded from the vessel Cuxhaven at the port of Rotterdam and subsequently loaded on the vessel Deo Gloria bound for Bilbao have provided no evidence that the cargo originated in Southern Rhodesia. Examination of the relevant documents revealed no irregularities. Moreover, as may be seen from the reports of the Security Council Committee ... the Netherlands customs authorities had earlier found no indication that the shipment in question originated in Southern Rhodesia."

(28) Case No. 103. Chrome ore - "Anna Presthus": United Kingdom note dated 30 October 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(29) Case No. 108. Minerals - "Schonfels": United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. The proposed note was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 18 December 1974, under the no-objection procedure, informing that Government of the Committee's dissatisfaction that no other document than a certificate of origin issued by a Chamber of Commerce in Mozambique was available to attest to the alleged origin of the merchandise in question. Moreover, the certificate had been issued in respect of "mainly chromium ores and concentrates", whereas the original report by the United Kingdom had referred to a cargo of nickel. Furthermore, the note expressed the Committee's surprise that the pertinent document had been issued in 1973 in respect of a transaction that had taken place in 1970. The Committee therefore requested the Government to undertake further investigations, paying particular attention to the recommended types of documentation circulated in the Secretary-General's note.

4. An acknowledgement dated 20 January 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

5. A first reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 19 March 1975.

6. A reply dated 24 March 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent German authorities conducted investigations in the offices of the import company in order to obtain documentation on its trade with Southern Africa. What they found were certificates of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce of Johannesburg. In view of the opinion of the Security Council Committee that these certificates are prima facie suspect, the German custom authorities requested additional documents. However, the South African seller refused to submit to the importer railroad bills of lading or custom documents, referring to internationally accepted commercial usage. Instead, he produced the certificates issued in Lourenco Marques which were shown to the officer of the United Nations Secretariat.

"In order to succeed in similar cases in obtaining documents from South African companies, the Federal Government would appreciate being informed as to where railroad bills of lading from South Africa and bills of entry from Mozambique have actually been brought to the notice of Member States of the Security Council."

(30) Case No. 110. Chrome ores - "Kybfels": United Kingdom note dated 13 January 1971

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(31) Case No. 116. Chrome ores and concentrates - "Rotenfels": United Kingdom note dated 31 March 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A note dated 20 May 1975 was received from Austria, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 4 of (27) Case No. 100 above.
4. In view of the identical reply sent by Austria in this case and in Case No. 100, it was decided that the standard note should similarly be sent to Austria, as well as to the other Governments concerned in this case, namely, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands. The matter would be drawn to the attention of the representative of Sweden in the Committee. Accordingly, the note was dispatched on 19 June 1975, and the Committee decided to put the case aside.
5. Replies were received from the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 22 July 1975 from the Netherlands

"The Netherlands authorities unfortunately are not in a position to reopen investigations on this case as they were concluded too long ago. They point out that in a note from the Acting Permanent Representative to the Secretary-General of 1 July 1971, their report was brought to the attention of the Security Council Committee.

"The Netherlands Government always takes considerable pains to look into any possible violations of sanctions as conscientiously as possible and to report to the Committee. With regard to import, transit, as well as transportation, of metals and ores the Netherlands exercises maximum vigilance to prevent violations of the sanctions. The Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971, together with the attached memoranda, have promptly been forwarded to the authorities in charge of supervising the observance of the sanctions."

(ii) Note dated 30 July 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shares the sentiment of regret expressed by the sanctions Committee about the delay in its reply to this Mission's note of 20 December 1972. This delay makes it practically impossible for the Federal Government to conduct further investigations into the matter.

"The Federal Government considers it most unfortunate that, in spite of the delay, the Committee chose to uphold its unsubstantiated suspicion and

expects the Federal Republic of Germany to disprove it. All the Federal Government can do is to explore all avenues open to it in the Federal Republic of Germany, as was done in the case in question. Investigations and interrogations of the enterprises and individuals concerned were carried out. Additional documents from South Africa are not available, and after a lapse of several years, another inquiry cannot be expected to produce a substantive reply even half-way satisfactory. The Federal Government is of the opinion that its intensive investigatory efforts in suspect cases need not shun comparison."

6. The Committee took note of the communications from the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany.

(32) Case No. 130. Chrome ore - "Agios Georgios": information supplied by Somalia on 27 March 1972

See annex III.

(33) Case No. 135. Chrome ore - "Santos Vega": information submitted by Somalia on 20 March 1972

See annex III.

(34) Case No. 153. Ferrochrome - "Itaimbe": United Kingdom note dated 24 August 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Brazil, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth, seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975.

(35) Case No. 165. Chrome ore - "Gemstone": United Kingdom note dated 5 February 1974

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(36) Case No. 212. Ferrochrome - "Gerd Wesch": United Kingdom note dated 9 July 1975

1. By a note dated 9 July 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of ferrochrome aboard the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further

investigation, that a consignment of ferrochrome shipped on the M. V. Gerd Wesch was of Southern Rhodesian origin. The information is to the effect that the M. V. Gerd Wesch was at the port of Lourenco Marques between 21 February 1975 and 25 February 1975 where she loaded a consignment of ferrochrome supplied by a Southern Rhodesian company, Universal Exports of Salisbury, for delivery to a Brazilian company, Acos Villares SA of Sao Paulo. The vessel subsequently called at Brazilian ports towards the end of March 1975. At one of which the ferrochrome was unloaded for delivery to the Brazilian importer. The M. V. Gerd Wesch is owned by a company of the Federal Republic of Germany, Jonny Wesch, Fahrdeich 181, 2101 Hamburg-Neunfelds 96.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Brazil in order to assist them with their enquiries into the possibility that any ferrochrome unloaded from the M. V. Gerd Wesch at a Brazilian port of delivery to Acos Villares SA was of Southern Rhodesian origin. Should the importer or shipping company claim that the ferrochrome is not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to documentary proof of origin contained in his notes PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 and to request the Government of Brazil to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the ferrochrome was of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany so as to assist them in any investigation they may wish to make into the shipment in one of their vessels of ferrochrome suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 18 July 1975 were sent to Brazil and to the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. An acknowledgement dated 25 July was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.
4. A reply dated 19 August 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany was received, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Since February 1974, the MV Gerd Wesch, owned by the shipping company, Jonny Wesch, KG, Hamburg, has been in the services of Messrs. African Coasters (Pty), Ltd., Durban, South Africa, on a time charter basis. The shipping company itself has no influence whatsoever on the cargo. The bills of lading are issued in each port by the agents of the charterer who has commissioned the vessel to operate in the mixed cargo service. Details as to the nature of the cargo are also unknown to the master of the vessel, whose

authority is confined to the technical loading sector. He is unable, therefore, to investigate the origin of the merchandise.

"Inquiries into the origin of the consignment of ferrochrome loaded at the port of Lourenço Marques can only be made by the charterer, as the shipowner is in no direct contact with either the discharger or the consignee."

5. A first reminder was sent to Brazil on 29 September 1975.
6. In the absence of a reply from Brazil, the Committee included that Government in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.
7. A second reminder was sent to Brazil on 2 December 1975.

Silicon

(37) Case No. 178. Silicon chrome - "Tsedek": United Kingdom note dated 7 June 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 233rd meeting on 10 April 1975, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement the text of which is reproduced below:

"On 23 August 1974, the representative of the United Kingdom was informed of a note from Israel containing information that the MV Gold Mountain (formerly MV Tsedek) was under a long-term charter to a Hong Kong Company. He indicated that the matter would be referred to his Government and that further information would be reported back as soon as possible.

"I am now able to inform the Committee of the Hong Kong authorities' investigations. They discovered that although the Gold Star Shipping Line is a company registered in Hong Kong, the line has no offices there; nor are any representatives of the company resident in Hong Kong. A local firm, the Sun Hing Shipping Co., act as Hong Kong agents for the Gold Star Shipping Line but are only involved when any of the line's vessels call at Hong Kong. Since the MV Gold Mountain did not call at Hong Kong en route to Japan on the journey in question, the local agents were unable to provide documentary or other evidence about the shipment of the silicon chrome.

"Although the Hong Kong authorities have been diligent in investigating this case, the end result does not take us very much further in discovering whether a breach of sanctions has occurred. They have volunteered to be as helpful as possible and have asked whether they could see a copy of the charter

agreement held by the Zim Israel Navigation Co., Ltd., of Haifa, Isarel, the original owners of the vessel. This should enable them to carry out further investigations."

4. At the same meeting the Committee decided that a note should be prepared under the no-objection procedure for transmission to Israel, requesting the Government to submit a copy of the charter agreement concluded with the Zim Israel Navigation Co., Ltd., the original owners of the vessel, for the benefit of the Hong Kong authorities in their future investigations.
5. At the 234th meeting on 24 April 1975, the Committee's attention was drawn to the fact that a similar request had previously been made to Israel to which the Government had replied that it could not obtain a copy of the required document, as it was regarded by the former owners of the vessel to be confidential (see Case No. 178, paras. 5 and 7, in the Committee's seventh report). It was agreed that the representative of the United Kingdom would ascertain from the Hong Kong authorities whether a specific part of the charter agreement would be particularly useful to them in pursuing their investigations; the Committee could then ask the Israeli authorities whether that specific part of the agreement could be obtained.
6. At the 245th meeting on 31 July 1975, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement to the Committee, the text of which is reproduced below:

"At the 234th meeting of this Committee, the question of Case No. 178 arose. This case involved the Gold Star Line, and a ship called the MV Gold Mountain (formerly Tsedek). I undertook to ascertain from the Hong Kong authorities whether a specific part of the charter agreement would be of any particular use to them in pursuing their investigations. I explained at the time that I proposed to do this so that, if any specific part of the agreement would be of real utility, this Committee would consider asking the Israeli authorities to supply that particular section of the charter party.

"I have now had a reply from the Hong Kong authorities. Indeed, the reply arrived three weeks ago, but I have not raised the matter before since we were not dealing with cases. The Hong Kong authorities have now replied, the substance of their answer being that they can think of no specific information which will be helpful. They too tried unsuccessfully to obtain a copy of the charter agreement. They did learn from the local agents of Gold Star that the vessel in question had been sold by the Zim-Israel Navigation Company Limited to the Cedar Shipping Corporation of Liberia on 5 April 1974, exactly one day before the vessel's arrival at Yokohama. The Hong Kong authorities did reopen their investigations but have been unable to get any further. In the course of their inquiries, they discovered that one of the directors of Gold Star Line is Moshe Bloche, who is resident in Japan. They have been given to understand that Mr. Bloche apparently plays an active part in the business of Gold Star Line. They do not know the nationality of Mr. Bloche.

"In these circumstances, I do not believe that the Hong Kong authorities can take their investigations any further. If the Committee wishes to pursue this case, then it would seem that the right direction would be to inquire of the Liberian authorities, since the vessel in question became the property of the Cedar Shipping Corporation of Liberia over a year ago."

7. At the 250th meeting on 2 October 1975, the Committee decided that a note should be addressed to Israel, expressing the Committee's regret at the inability of the Israeli authorities to obtain a copy of the relevant charter party agreement from the Zim Israel Navigation Co., Ltd. The Committee would also request the Government of Israel once again to make the utmost efforts to obtain and forward a full and complete copy of the document. The note, adopted by the Committee under the no-objection procedure was sent to Israel on 22 October 1975.

(38) Case No. 179. High-grade silicon metal - "Atlantic Fury": United Kingdom note dated 18 June 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 27 February 1975 was received from Belgium, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Belgian Customs and Excise Administration carried out a thorough investigation at the Sudamin firm. The file concerning trade transactions was carefully studied, and no evidence was found that the firm had been aware of a possible later transfer of the goods to Rhodesia. The Customs and Excise Administration found nothing to show that the Sudamin firm had violated the regulations enacted by Belgium with respect to trade with Rhodesia."

4. In the absence of a reply from Liberia, the Committee again included that Government in the quarterly list issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
5. A note dated 24 April was sent to Belgium under the no-objection procedure, requesting the Government to submit copies of all the documentation examined by the investigating authorities.
6. A reply dated 6 May 1975 was received from the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"By that note you were good enough to inform me of a request by the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee would like to have copies of all documents submitted to the authorities responsible for investigating the Sudamin affair.

"I have transmitted the note to the Belgian Government, which, however, before considering the Committee's request, asks me to inquire from you whether the note is in accordance with a particular rule or established practice."

7. A note dated 16 June 1975 was sent to Belgium under the no-objection procedure, assuring the Government that it was normal practice for the Committee, found highly necessary for the proper conduct of its work, to request Governments to submit copies of the documents examined by the investigating authorities; it therefore renewed its request to the Government of Belgium to send copies of the pertinent documents in the case at hand, bearing in mind the proper documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

8. Further to paragraph 4 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.

9. A first reminder was sent to Belgium on 27 August 1975.

10. A reply dated 3 September 1975 was received from the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The affair referred to in the above-mentioned note was first raised in your communication of 2 July 1974, in which you drew my Government's attention to this matter for the first time.

"By its note of 5 July 1974 the Permanent Mission of Belgium acknowledged receipt of your note and stated that the sanctions Committee's request had been communicated to the competent Belgian authorities.

"Since then the Belgian authorities have opened a file on the case and have made detailed inquiries with all the government offices in a position to provide useful information.

"The care which my Government has taken to ensure that no aspect of the case was overlooked explains why it was not possible to reply within the time-limit specified by the sanctions Committee.

"On 27 February 1975, on the instructions of my authorities, I was able to send you a letter in which I informed you that:

"The Belgian Customs and Excise Administration carried out a thorough investigation at the Sudamin firm. The file concerning trade transactions was carefully studied, and no evidence was found that the firm had been aware of a possible later transfer of the goods to Rhodesia. The Customs and Excise Administration found nothing to show that the Sudamin firm had violated the regulations enacted by Belgium with respect to trade with Rhodesia."

"However, it appears that the sanctions Committee was not satisfied with my Government's statement, and your note of 24 April 1975 informed me that:

"It felt, however, that in the fulfilment of its mandate as established by the Security Council, it would be grateful if copies of all documentation submitted to the investigating authorities could be provided to it."

"In this connexion, my Government requests me to inform you that, for statutory and regulative reasons, the Belgian Customs Administration, which is the competent authority in this case, is not in a position to forward the documentation which the sanctions Committee desires.

"However, I can assure you once again that the Belgian Government, having examined this documentation, has not found any evidence that the Sudamin firm has violated the regulations established by Belgium with regard to trade with Rhodesia.

"It goes without saying that if the sanctions Committee has information disproving this conclusion, the Belgian Government would be happy to receive that information, with a view to initiating a new inquiry.

"The last note which you sent me, on 27 August 1975, specifically the last part of the third paragraph, draws my Government's attention to the quarterly lists naming the Governments which have not replied within the prescribed time-limit of two months to questions posed by the Committee concerning possible violations of the sanctions.

"My Government considers that it has replied, in a clear and unequivocal manner, to the Committee's request by the above-mentioned letter of 27 February 1975, of which this letter constitutes confirmation.

"In view of the foregoing, I hope that the sanctions Committee will accept the negative conclusion of my authorities in this affair and that Belgium will not therefore be included in the quarterly lists referred to in your note of 27 August 1975."

. Further to paragraph 8 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the 8th quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

ferro-manganese

19) Case No. 185. Ferro-manganese - "Straat Nagasaki"

Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. A first reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 16 December 1974 and a second one on 21 January 1975.

4. A reply dated 5 February 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"With regard to the request for further information contained in the Secretary-General's above-mentioned note of 16 October, the Acting Permanent Representative may refer to the Permanent Representative's note of 24 September 1974, No. 5309. An additional investigation conducted by the Netherlands Ministry of Traffic and Water Resources did not produce any further data which had not already been furnished in the Permanent Representative's note of 24 September 1974.

"The Netherlands Government has also considered the request of the Security Council Committee to transmit to it copies of the documentation pertaining to the transport of the above-mentioned shipment. The Acting Permanent Representative wishes to remind that the Netherlands Government on several similar occasions has stated that it is not in a position to comply with such requests, since documentation of that kind belongs to the shipping company concerned and as such cannot be made available to the Committee under the Netherlands law without the consent of that company."

5. A reply dated 27 February 1975, together with documentation, was received from Uruguay, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"(1) In this connexion, we have received the following information from our Government: Ernesto Quincke, S.A., has not imported any ferro-manganese, since it is only the representative of Metalloys, Ltd., Johannesburg, the South African suppliers.

"(2) There is no record in the files of the Banco de la Republica, the state organ which controls imports, of any manifest for the reshipment of ferro-manganese imports from Rio de Janeiro to Montevideo.

"(3) On 14 August 1973, the INLASA company applied to the Banco de la Republica for the necessary authorization to import 156 drums of ferro-manganese from South Africa, to be purchased from Metalloys, Ltd., Johannesburg.

"(4) The said merchandise was shipped on board the Straat Nagoya, a/ registered in the Netherlands, which left Durban on 3 April 1974 and arrived at Montevideo on 27 April 1974.

"As you will appreciate from the foregoing information and the attached

a/ The name of the vessel reported in the United Kingdom note and referred to in the reply from the Netherlands was given as Straat Nagasaki, but the reply and documents from Uruguay give the name Straat Nagoya.

documentation, which was supplied to us by our Government, it is quite clear that this shipment of ferro-manganese originated in the Republic of South Africa and not in Rhodesia, as is implied in the note sent to the Committee by the United Kingdom on 20 June 1974."

6. The accompanying documentation, analysed and summarized by the expert consultant, comprised 10 certificates and communications exchanged between the Industria Nacional Laminadora, S.A. (INLASA), of Montevideo, and certain Uruguayan authorities, on one hand, and between INLASA and the South African firm of Metalloys, Ltd., Johannesburg, on the other. Eight of those certificates had been issued in respect of 39 metric tons of ferro-manganese, declared to be of South African origin and for shipment to Montevideo aboard the Straat Nagoya. They included a Uruguayan customs clearance form, an insurance certificate issued by the State Security Bank of Uruguay and consular invoice issued by the Uruguayan Consulate in Durban, South Africa. The other two communications referred to a request by INLASA, and its subsequent withdrawal, for a licence to import 50,000 kg. of ferro-manganese from Chile.

7. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 247th meeting, a note dated 24 September 1975 was sent to Uruguay under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below.

"The Secretary-General of the United Nations has the honour to refer to the reply dated 27 February 1975 sent by the Permanent Representative concerning case No. 185.

"The Committee took note with interest of the information contained in that reply. It felt it necessary, however, to draw attention to the fact that the vessel referred to in the United Kingdom note of 20 June 1974 transmitted to the Permanent Mission of Uruguay on 12 July 1974 was the Straat Nagasaki. In its reply, the Permanent Mission refers to a vessel by the name of Straat Nagoya.

"The Committee would appreciate receiving clarification on this matter and any appropriate information concerning the Straat Nagasaki. Should the information already transmitted to the Committee in connexion with the Straat Nagoya be intended to cover the Straat Nagasaki case, the Committee wondered whether the investigating authorities were shown a certificate of origin for the cargo in question. A copy of each certificate would be useful in examining the case.

"The Committee expressed the hope that His Excellency's Government would be in a position to send its comments on this case at its earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

8. A first reminder was sent to Uruguay on 4 December 1975.

Tungsten ore

- (40) Case No. 78. Tungsten ore - "Tenko Maru" and "Suruga Maru": United Kingdom note dated 28 May 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

Copper

- (41) Case No. 12. Copper concentrates - "Tjipondok": United Kingdom note dated 12 May 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

- (42) Case No. 15. Copper concentrates - "Eizan Maru": United Kingdom note dated 4 June 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (43) Case No. 34. Copper exports: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (44) Case No. 51. Copper concentrates - "Straat Futami": United Kingdom note dated 8 October 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(45) Case No. 99. Copper - various ships: United Kingdom note dated 9 October 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

Nickel

(46) Case No. 102. Nickel - "Randfontein": United Kingdom note dated 28 October 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Spain, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
4. A reply dated 16 June 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Investigations made by the competent Spanish authorities concerning a shipment of nickel unloaded from the vessel Randfontein at the port of Rotterdam, part of which was declared to be in transit to Spain, have provided no evidence that the shipment originated in Southern Rhodesia. Examination of the relevant documents revealed no irregularities. Moreover, as may be seen from the reports of the Security Council Committee ... the Netherlands customs authorities had earlier found no indication that the shipment in question originated in Southern Rhodesia."

(47) Case No. 109: Nickel - "Sloterkerk": United Kingdom note dated 11 January 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Spain, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
4. A reply dated 16 June 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigations carried out by the competent Spanish authorities with respect to a shipment of nickel unloaded on 12 January 1971 from the vessel Sloterkerk at the port of Rotterdam, part of which was sent to Spain, have produced no evidence that said shipment originated in Southern Rhodesia. Examination of the relevant documents has revealed no irregularity. Furthermore, and as can be seen from the reports of the Security Council Committee ... the customs authorities of the Netherlands had earlier found no indication that the said shipment originated in Southern Rhodesia."

(48) Case No. 118. Nickel - "Serooskerk": United Kingdom note dated 6 May 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Spain, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
4. A reply dated 16 June 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Spain ... has the honour to inform him [the Secretary-General], that investigations carried out by the competent Spanish authorities with respect to a shipment of nickel unloaded from the vessel Serooskerk at the port of Rotterdam, part of which was declared to be in transit to Spain, have produced no evidence that the said shipment originated in Southern Rhodesia. Examination of the relevant documents has revealed no irregularity. Furthermore, and as can be seen from the reports of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), the customs authorities of the Netherlands had earlier found no indication that the said shipment originated in Southern Rhodesia."

(49) Case No. 184. Nickel - "Kungshamn": United Kingdom note dated 2 July 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the report is given below.
3. A reply dated 17 December 1974 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The South African seller has refused to produce the corresponding railroad bills of lading referring to internationally accepted commercial usage. Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has asked the competent South African authorities through diplomatic channels to provide the desired additional documents. An answer has not yet been received.

"Photocopies of five certificates of origin from the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce and of a letter from the South African Firm Omelta Agents (Pty), Ltd., Johannesburg to the German firm Hans Grun are available for perusal at this Mission."

In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 203rd meeting, the expert consultant visited the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations and examined the documents mentioned in the above reply. The result of that examination showed that the documentary evidence available consisted of copies of five certificates of origin issued by the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce and five bills of lading in respect of a total of 630 boxes (281,228 kg) of nickel, as well as copy of a letter from the South African firm of Omelta Agents (Pty) Ltd., Johannesburg, addressed to the firm of Hans Grun Handelsgesellschaft. The text of that letter is reproduced below.

"We still have to reply to your letter of 25 July 1974 from which we understand that your authorities have asked for additional evidence regarding the origin of the nickel cathodes which we have been shipping to you.

"The subject of South Africa suppliers having to submit unusual documentation to overseas buyers and/or ship owners in order to provide double proof that the goods supplied and/or shipped are really of South African origin has been the subject of a number of discussions held under the chairmanship of the South African Department of Commerce and Industry, which is a Government institution, and the advice given by our Government is that nobody should volunteer to agree to any extraordinary documentation. In other words, South Africa should not be singled out as a source of material where our suppliers have to provide documents such as rail consignment notes etc., etc., but the South African trade should be handled similarly as any other country's trade and any normal proof required regarding origin should also be applicable to this country.

"We have been requested by the Department that if any approaches are made to us as regards extraordinary documentation we should advise the country's authority concerned that they should please communicate with the South African consul-general or embassy in such country and the request for special documents should then be channelled through the official departments available on a Government-to-Government basis, and we would then be instructed by our authorities as to how to proceed in each instance."

5. A second reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 5 February 1975, which crossed with a reply of the same date from that Government, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As a result of an inquiry conducted by the Netherlands authorities it has been established that the vessel on 17 and 21 May 1974 unloaded five consignments of nickel amounting to 281,288 kilogrammes at the port of Rotterdam. The consignments were subsequently transported for the account of the company Hans Grun Handelsgesellschaft, GmbH Dusseldorf in the Federal Republic of Germany. None of the shipments in question were imported into the Netherlands. The transportation was directed to several destinations in different western European countries. It could not be established by the Netherlands authorities whether these destinations were of an intermediary or final nature.

"The investigation, furthermore, yielded no evidence of the shipments originating in Southern Rhodesia. This can be explained by the fact that the inquiry in the Netherlands had to be limited to the shipping agent and the conveyors concerned who did not have commercial documentation pertaining to the shipments at their disposal."

6. A reply dated 13 February 1975 was also received from Sweden, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Chief Public Prosecutor has assigned the matter to the Prosecutor in the District of Stockholm. The Prosecutor's investigation shows that MS Kungshamn, owned by the Salen Shipping Company, shipped a consignment of nickel in five lots from Lourenco Marques to Rotterdam during a voyage April-May 1974. The Prosecutor has held oral hearings with representatives of the Salen Shipping Company, as well as the captain of the vessel and its first mate who served during the voyage in question. Furthermore, the Prosecutor has procured the documentation considered to be of importance to judge the ship's officers' and the shipping company's handling of the consignment. The Prosecutor has arrived at the conclusion that, within the scope of pre-judicial inquiry, no further evidence of a nature to elucidate the circumstances surrounding the transportation of the nickel consignment is available. No reason to prosecute according to Swedish law before a Swedish court has been found. Thus, the Prosecutor has decided not to take any further action in the case.

"Should, however, any further information be obtained in Sweden concerning this case or should the Committee on sanctions be able to provide further documentary evidence that will assist the competent Swedish authorities in their investigations, the Permanent Representative shall not fail to communicate them to the parties concerned."

7. A note dated 10 April 1975 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, under the no-objection procedure, requesting the Government to pursue the matter

further, giving particular attention to documentary evidence recommended in the Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 and to submit copies of any such documents that might become available.

8. An acknowledgement dated 22 April 1975 was received from that Government.
9. A reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 1 July 1975.
10. An acknowledgement dated 10 July 1975 was received from that Government.
11. In the absence of a reply from the Federal Republic of Germany, the Committee included that Government in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 July 1975.
12. A reply dated 16 July was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The endeavours of the Federal Government to obtain additional information through diplomatic channels have resulted in a letter from the agent in Lourenco Marques which confirmed that the goods had been shipped from Middleburg in Transvaal.

"The Federal Government has, in several past cases of suspected sanctions violations, proved its readiness to secure and make available the relevant documentation in keeping with accepted trade practices. It would, therefore, appreciate learning which members of the sanctions Committee succeeded in obtaining additional original documents from South Africa."

13. At the 247th meeting on 4 September 1975, the Committee considered the matter and decided that the case should be closed.

(50) Case No. 193. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Pleias": United Kingdom note dated 22 October 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. First reminders were sent to the Netherlands on 15 January 1975 and to Greece and the Federal Republic of Germany on 27 January 1975.
4. Two replies were received from the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 5 February 1975 from the Netherlands

"An inquiry conducted by the Netherlands authorities yielded evidence

that on 2 and 3 August 1974 the above-mentioned vessel unloaded two consignments of nickel amounting to 322,972 kg. at the port of Rotterdam. The consignments were subsequently transported on the account of the company Hans Grun Handelsgesellschaft, GmbH, Dusseldorf, in the Federal Republic of Germany. It has been established that the cargo in question was not imported into the Netherlands.

"The investigation, furthermore, did not produce any evidence of the consignments originating in Southern Rhodesia. This conclusion can be explained by the fact that the inquiry in the Netherlands had to be limited to the shipping agent and the conveyers concerned, who did not have commercial documents pertaining to the shipments at their disposal."

(ii) Note dated 10 February 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"Investigations in the offices of the firm GRUN in Dusseldorf have not brought to light any evidence as to the alleged Southern Rhodesian origin of the merchandise.

"As soon as a final report on the results of the investigation is received from the competent revenue office in Dusseldorf, further details will be communicated to the Secretary-General."

5. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114 below.

6. A further reply dated 22 April 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The information received from the competent German authorities is to the effect that a thorough examination of the available documents (sales contract and certificates of origin from the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce) have proven that the consignment of electrolytic nickel cathodes, which the German firm Grun purchased from the South African firm Omelta Agents (Pty.), Ltd., in Johannesburg, is of South African origin.

"In this connexion, the Federal Government would like to refer to a similar case where the same South African seller had refused to furnish the importing firm with the relevant railroad bills of lading and customs documents pointing out that this was contrary to internationally accepted commercial usage.

"In order to facilitate the efforts of the Federal Government to clarify such questions, it would be appreciated if cases were made known to it in which South African sellers have supplied buyers with these additional documents."

Lithium ores

- (51) Case No. 20. Petalite - "Sado Maru": United Kingdom note dated 30 June 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (52) Case No. 24. Petalite - "Abbekerk": United Kingdom note dated 12 July 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (53) Case No. 30. Petalite - "Simonskerk": United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (54) Case No. 32. Petalite - "Yang Tse": United Kingdom note dated 6 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

- (55) Case No. 46. Petalite - "Kyotai Maru": United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

- (56) Case No. 54. Lepidolite - "Ango": United Kingdom note dated 24 October 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (57) Case No. 86. Petalite ore - "Krugerland": United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

- (58) Case No. 107. Tantalite - "Table Bay": United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(59) Case No. 151. Petalite - "Merrimac": United Kingdom note dated 30 July 1973

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

Pig-iron and steel billets

(60) Case No. 29. Pig-iron - "Mare Piceno": United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(61) Case No. 70. Steel billets - United Kingdom note dated 16 February 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(62) Case No. 85. Steel billets - "Despinan" and "Birooni": United Kingdom note dated 30 July 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the sixth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Liberia and Panama, the Committee again included those Governments in the sixth, seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975.

(63) Case No. 114. Steel products - "Gemini Exporter": United Kingdom note dated 3 February 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the sixth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. As indicated in the seventh report, b/ the Committee had before it for consideration a comprehensive analysis of all the cases involving Greece, together with a draft comprehensive note to that Government. Following the Committee's decision under the no-objection procedure, the proposed note was sent to Greece on 2 April 1975. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below.

b/ See S/11594/Rev.1, annex II, (62) Case No. 114, para. 13.

"During its consideration of a number of cases of possible violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, the Committee's particular attention has been drawn to those cases involving Greece, mainly by virtue of that country being the country of registration of the ships reported to have been used in transporting the prohibited merchandise. In that connexion, the Committee has noted that to date there are 17 such outstanding cases (Case Nos. 112, 114, 117, 124, 130, 138, 147, 193, 195, USI-11, USI-12, USI-14, USI-21, USI-25, USI-29 and USI-32), a number of which concern shipments that have actually been stated, not merely suspected, to have originated in Southern Rhodesia. The 18th outstanding case (INGO-4) pertains to air transport agreements involving Air Rhodesia.

"The Committee views with great concern any actions that may facilitate the violation of sanctions, especially the provision of the means of transporting contraband merchandise from Southern Rhodesia, contrary to the various resolutions of the Security Council establishing sanctions against that Territory, particularly paragraph 3 (c) of resolution 253 (1968). For that reason, the Committee has endeavoured on various occasions to seek the co-operation of His Excellency's Government in ensuring that such facilities are not made available. The Committee was grateful to His Excellency's Government for the information supplied by the following notes, each of which constitutes the last communication received by the Committee in connexion with the specified cases: note dated 27 September 1973 in connexion with Case No. 147; noted dated 11 June 1974 in connexion with Case No. USI-21; note dated 27 August 1974 in connexion with Case Nos. 117 and 124; noted dated 30 October 1974 in connexion with Case Nos. 112, 114, 130, 138, USI-5, USI-11, USI-12, and USI-14; and note dated 21 November 1974 in connexion with Case Nos. 193, USI-29 and USI-32.

"On the basis of the above-cited notes, the Committee has taken note of the following facts: that the defendants in the cases of the vessels Evangelos M (Case No. 112) and Gemini Exporter (Case No. 114) were acquitted by the Magistrate's Court of Piraeus; that the case of the vessel Venthisikimi (Case No. USI-5) was dismissed at the request of the Deputy District Attorney of Athens as approved by the District Attorney of the Court of Appeals; that the case of the vessel Agios Giorgios (Case No. 130) was to be taken up by the Magistrate's Court of Piraeus during January 1975; that the cases of the vessels Aliakom Pilot (Case No. 138), Ocean Pegasus (Case No. USI-5), Hellenic Destiny (Case No. USI-11), Costas Frangos (Case No. USI-12), Nortrans Unity (Case No. USI-14), Hellenic Destiny (Case No. USI-21) were referred to the Public Prosecutor of Piraeus; that further investigations were ordered by the District Attorney of Piraeus in the cases of the vessels Drymakos (Case No. 117), and Armonia (Case No. 124); that investigations had been started by the competent Greek authorities in the cases of the vessels Anangel Ambition (Case No. 147), MV Pleias (Case No. 193), Hellenic Laurel (Case No. USI-29), and Hellenic Carrier (Case No. USI-32); that no information was provided by His Excellency's Government

in connexion with the cases of the vessels Hellenic Leader (Case No. USI-5) and North Highness (Case No. USI-5); that no reply has, as yet, been received in connexion with the case of the vessel MV Soula K (Case No. 195), nor in connexion with the case of the vessel Hellenic Destiny (Case No. USI-25); and that there has been no response at all from His Excellency's Government to the Committee's inquiry of 13 May 1974 as to whether Olympic Airways, SA, has entered into passenger and/or cargo agreements, or parts thereof, with Air Rhodesia.

"The Committee would be grateful to be informed of the outcome of the trials in connexion with the cases referred to the Public Prosecutor of Piraeus (Case Nos. 138, USI-11, USI-12, USI-14, USI-21), as well as the case before the Magistrate's Court of Piraeus (Case No. 130). The Committee would also be grateful to be informed of the results of the investigations undertaken by the competent Greek authorities in connexion with cases which at the time of the last communication from His Excellency were still under investigation (Case Nos. 117, 124, 147, 193, USI-29 and USI-32).

"With reference to cases which were dismissed in Court or in which defendants were reported to have been acquitted (Case No. USI-5 re the vessel Venthisikimi and Case Nos. 112 and 114, respectively), the summary nature of the information received has not enabled the Committee to dispose of these cases in a conclusive manner. The Committee would appreciate it if His Excellency's Government could provide additional information regarding these cases. It hopes to receive such information at the earliest possible date.

"The Committee would also like to draw attention to the fact that it still awaits information as to what action has been taken by the Greek Government in the cases of the vessels Hellenic Leader and North Highness (Case No. USI-5), MV Soula K (Case No. 195) and Hellenic Destiny (Case No. USI-25), as well as the Government's reply to its inquiry in connexion with Case No. INGO-4. The Committee would also be grateful to receive information on these cases as soon as possible.

"The Committee has invited the Secretary-General to remind His Excellency that it places great reliance on the co-operation of the Governments in the performance of its work; for this reason, it wishes its concern over the incomplete status of its inquiries in the above-cited cases to be communicated to His Excellency's Government. In doing so, the Committee has expressed the hope that the Greek Government would once again demonstrate its co-operation in this matter in the same manner that it had demonstrated in connexion with Case No. 154 in the past, for which the Committee has expressed its full appreciation. It appeals to the Government to bring its correspondence up-to-date by providing the information requested, in order to help the Committee pursue and conclude its inquiries.

"Regarding the inquiry in His Excellency's note dated 30 October 1974 as to whether the Committee could provide more specific and substantial evidence of possible violations of sanctions by ships under Greek registry, the Committee has indicated that it was the responsibility of Governments, not of the Committee, to enforce sanctions and to seek information concerning possible violations.

"The Committee expresses the hope that His Excellency's Government will give urgent attention to the matters raised in this note and submit any comments thereon at the earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

A reply dated 20 June 1975 was received from Greece, the substantive part which reads as follows:

"With reference to the Secretary-General's note of 2 April 1975, the Permanent Representative of Greece has the honour to inform His Excellency that the contents of the said note are actively being re-examined by the competent Greek authorities who sincerely regret that because of the number and complexity of the cases mentioned by the Security Council Committee ... they have not yet been able to give a substantive reply.

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations wishes to give to the Committee the unequivocal assurance that it is the Greek Government's firm policy to implement fully the resolutions of the Security Council concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia. In keeping with this unswerving stand the competent Greek departments are in receipt of urgent instructions to expedite the drawing up of a comprehensive report regarding the aforementioned cases.

"The Permanent Mission wishes to remind the Committee that according to Greek laws regulating the matter, violation of Security Council resolutions concerning Southern Rhodesia is a serious offence punishable by strict penalties. In a circular dated 19 May 1975 (sub. No. 50728/2/69) the Greek Ministry of Mercantile Marine informed all members of the Marine Chamber of Greece and all associations of Greek shipowners of the contents of His Excellency's note of 3 March 1975 and stressed that any transgression of the pertinent Greek legislation will be dealt with in accordance with the strictest interpretation of the law. In the same spirit, the Greek Ministry of Commerce, by its circular No. 32324/4126/1634, conveyed to all all Greek prefectures as well as to the competent department of the Bank of Greece and to all currency control committees, the information contained in the note dated 13 March 1975 addressed to the Security Council Committee and attached to His Excellency's note of 26 March 1975 regarding Case No. 204.

"The Permanent Representative of Greece is confident that the efficient co-operation existing between the Committee and the Greek authorities will continue in a spirit of mutual confidence and assistance."

5. A further reply dated 5 September 1975 was received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations ... further to his note of 20 June 1975, has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the cases mentioned in his note of 2 April 1975 continue to be studied intensively by the competent Greek authorities. Every effort is being made towards the strict implementation of the Greek legislation on the matter. It is pointed out, however, that such implementation has to take into account the general provisions of Greek penal procedural law, as well as the fact that the persons involved in many of these cases are employed on ocean-going ships which rarely call at Greek ports.

"In the light of these factors and on the basis of past experience, the competent authorities in Greece are wondering whether the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) could not examine the advisability of extending the one or two months' delay in which Greek authorities are usually expected to furnish information on the final outcome of cases such as the aforementioned.

"In looking into this suggestion, the Committee might also take into consideration the complexity of these cases from the viewpoint of domestic law, as well as the fact that replying to the Committee's communications involves correspondence between this Mission and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Athens, as well as between the latter and other departments such as the Ministry of Mercantile Marine, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Commerce.

"In making this suggestion, the Greek competent authorities are prompted by the conviction that the Committee shares their wish for continued close co-operation on an efficient and pragmatic basis."

6. With regard to Case No. 114, a reply dated 3 November 1975 was received from Greece, transmitting the official translation of the judgement in which the accused had been acquitted, and of which the Committee had previously been so informed. c/

(64) Case No. 137. Steel billets - "Malaysia Fortune": United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the sixth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

c/ Ibid., para. 12 (i).

3. In the absence of replies from them the Committee included Jordan and again Liberia in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March, and again included those two Governments in the seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(65) Case No. 138. Steel billets - "Aliakmon Pilot": United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the sixth report.

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(66) Case No. 140. Steel billets and maize - "Char Hwa": United Kingdom note dated 9 April 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the sixth report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of replies from them the Committee again included Jordan and Panama in the sixth, seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

Graphite

(67) Case No. 38. Graphite - "Kaapland": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969

See annex IV.

(68) Case No. 43. Graphite - "Tanga": United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969

See annex IV.

(69) Case No. 62. Graphite - "Transvaal", "Kaapland", "Stellenbosch" and "Swellendam": United Kingdom note dated 22 December 1969

See annex IV.

B. MINERAL FUELS

(70) Case No. 172. Crude oil: United Kingdom note dated 7 May 1974

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(71) Case No. 187. Crushed coking coal: United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A first reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 22 January 1975.
4. An acknowledgement dated 27 January was received from that Government followed by a reply dated 5 February 1975, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Investigations in the offices of the firm Krupp-Brennstoffhandel in Hamburg have not brought to light any evidence as to the Southern Rhodesian origin of the merchandise. However, the Federal Government has asked the competent authorities to conduct a further investigation in the head offices of the above-mentioned firm in Essen. The results of this investigation will be communicated to the Secretary-General as soon as possible."

4. A second reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 19 March 1975, inquiring whether the investigations by the Federal authorities had been completed and whether the results could be communicated to the Committee.
5. A reply dated 14 April 1975 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Investigations conducted in the meantime in the head office of the firm Krupp-Brennstoffhandel in Essen have not yielded any evidence that the imported merchandise was of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"Further investigations by the Federal Government have proved that the crushed coking coal to which the note of the Secretary-General of 23 July 1974 refers is also produced in Moatize/Mozambique and supplied to German firms."

6. A note dated 7 May 1975 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany under the no-objection procedure, requesting the Government to indicate the means, including documentary evidence, copies of which would be appreciated, by which the investigating authorities had concluded that the consignment of coking coal in question was not of Southern Rhodesian origin.

7. An acknowledgement dated 13 May 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

8. A reply dated 9 June 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In the course of the investigations conducted by the competent German authorities in the offices of the firm Krupp-Brennstoffhandel in Hamburg and in Essen, all documents (card files, correspondence, sales contracts, shipping and custom documents) concerning the import of crushed coking coal were carefully examined. The examination revealed that the company purchased coal from numerous countries and among others some smaller quantities from South Africa with port of lading Lourenço Marques. The respective certificates of origin issued by the Camera de Comercio de Lourenço Marques were confirmed by the complete records of the relevant sales contracts.

"Furthermore, the firm Krupp-Brennstoffhandel has imported crushed coking coal from a firm in Moatize/Mozambique with port of lading Beira. However, in 1974, the merchandise could no longer be shipped due to transportation difficulties. To comply with the suggestions of the Secretary-General contained in his memoranda, the Federal Government conducted further investigations through its Consulate General in Mozambique in order to ascertain whether or not coal of the aforementioned kind is being produced in and exported from Moatize. This has been affirmed.

"Thus, no evidence could be found which would in any way support the suspicion voiced by the British Government. The Government of the United Kingdom has also been informed to this effect."

9. At the 247th meeting on 4 September 1975 the Committee considered the matter and decided that, since no further development seemed likely to occur, the case should be closed.

C. TOBACCO

(72) Case No. 4. Tobacco - "Mokaria": United Kingdom note dated 24 January 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the second report.

(73) Case No. 10. Tobacco - "Mohasi": United Kingdom note dated 29 March 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(74) Case No. 19. Tobacco - "Goodwill": United Kingdom note dated 25 June 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(75) Case No. 26. Transactions in Southern Rhodesia tobacco: United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(76) Case No. 35. Tobacco - "Montaigle": United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(77) Case No. 82. Tobacco - "Elias L": United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(78) Case No. 92. Cigarettes believed to be manufactured in Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(79) Case No. 98. Tobacco - "Hellenic Beach": United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fifth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(80) Case No. 104. Tobacco - "Agios Nicolaos": United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fifth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama and Greece, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(81) Case No. 105. Tobacco - "Montalto": United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(82) Case No. 149. Tobacco - "Straat Holland": United Kingdom note dated 19 July 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 234th meeting on 24 April 1975, the Committee decided that a note should be prepared for its consideration for transmission to Indonesia; meanwhile, that the Chairman should contact the representative of Indonesia personally to see if a substantive reply could be obtained that way.
4. At the 235th meeting on 5 June 1975, the Acting Chairman reported, and the representative of Indonesia also confirmed, that the Permanent Mission of Indonesia would again request its Government to deal with the matter more urgently. The representative of Indonesia requested that, under the circumstances, no note be sent to his Government for the time being.
5. A reply dated 19 June 1975 was received from Indonesia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations ... with reference to consideration by the sanctions Committee of the case concerning the importation by Indonesia of a consignment of tobacco, suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin aboard the Straat Holland, has the honour to submit herewith the documents relevant to the aforementioned case."

Enclosure

Letter dated 20 August 1973 addressed to the Director-General of the Foreign Economic Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by the Department of Trade, Indonesia

"Referring to your letter No. 6600/73/17 dated 19 July 1973 addressed to the head of the Foreign Commerce Bureau of the Department of Trade and letter No. 68252/73/22 dated 25 July 1973 addressed to the Director of the Directorate of Importation of the Department of Trade, I would like to inform you that the communication of the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations concerning the case of the Indonesian tobacco importation from Rhodesia proved to be incorrect. Our actions in this matter have been principally based on the certificates of origin of the tobacco, showing that the tobacco consignment originated from Mozambique and Malawi. For your consideration, we have herewith attached photo-copies of those certificates as follows:

1. Certificate of origin Mozambique = 61 cases
2. Certificate of origin Mozambique = 62 cases
3. Certificate of origin Mozambique = 77 cases (15,510 kg)
4. Certificate of origin Malawi = 11,200 lbs

"It is necessary to emphasize that the tobacco received from the ship MV Straat Holland of the Koninklyke Java-China Paketvaart Lynen, which was transhipped to Indonesia, originated from Mozambique and Malawi.

"Your attention to this note will be appreciated."

6. The documentation enclosed consisted of:

(a) A certificate of origin No. 6279, issued and sealed on 17 May 1973 by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi in respect of 11,200 lbs of tobacco, net, destined for Malange, Indonesia;

(b) A certificate of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce of Beira (figures for dates and weight measures illegible);

(c) A certificate of origin issued and sealed by the Chamber of Commerce of Beira on 26 April 1973, declaring that waybills (rail notes) had been produced attesting to the Mozambique origin of 62 cases of flue-cured tobacco for shipment aboard the Straat Holland; and

(d) A certificate of origin as in (c) above in respect of 61 cases.

(83) Case No. 156. Tobacco - "Hellenic Glory": United Kingdom note dated 4 October 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Two acknowledgements dated 27 January and 7 February 1975 were received from Egypt, indicating that the matter was still under investigation by the competent Egyptian authorities, and that any relevant comments and documentation would be forwarded immediately upon receipt.
4. In the absence of replies from Panama and Zambia, the Committee included those Governments in the sixth quarterly list which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
5. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.
6. A reply dated 24 March 1975, enclosing two certificates of origin Nos. 326 and 339, which had been requested by the Committee, was received from Egypt.
7. A note dated 24 April 1974 was sent to Egypt under the no-objection procedure, expressing the Committee's appreciation for the Government's co-operation in its inquiries.
8. Further to paragraph 4 above, the Committee again included Panama and Zambia in the seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(84) Case No. 157. Tobacco - "Oranjeland": United Kingdom note dated 9 October 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 239th meeting on 29 May 1975 the Secretary informed the Committee that in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at the 203rd meeting, a member of the Secretariat had gone to the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany and examined the documents referred to in the Federal Republic's note of 31 May 1974. d/ Those documents were:

d/ Ibid., annex II, (84), Case No. 157, para. 8.

(a) A certificate of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce of Beira on 2 July 1973, in respect of 130 cases of tobacco in three groups marked as follows: MK2-1/49, MK/6-1/25, MK9-1/56. The shipment was given as originating in Mozambique and shipped aboard the MV Oranjeland;

(b) A phytosanitary certificate issued by the Plant Protection Service of the State of Mozambique on 2 July 1973, in respect of 130 cases of tobacco, marked exactly as above. The shipper was given as Mitchell Cotts and Co. (SA) (Pty.) Ltd., Beira, and the consignee was given as Werner Trense Leaf Tobacco Agency, Munich, Federal Republic of Germany. The shipment was transported aboard the MV Oranjeland for delivery into the port of Hamburg. (It was pointed out to the Committee that that certificate was similar to that submitted by Austria in respect of 113 cases of tobacco, which was part of the total shipment of tobacco aboard the ship.)

4. At the same meeting, in reply to a question from the Acting Chairman, the expert consultant stated that the documentation in question did not represent satisfactory proof of origin.

5. The Committee then decided to leave the case open until it had time to consider the whole question of the trade in southern African tobacco.

(85) Case No. 164. Tobacco - "Mexico Maru": United Kingdom note dated 30 January 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Indonesia, the Committee included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.

4. A reply dated 14 April 1975, enclosing copies of documentary evidence, was received from Indonesia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Indonesian Government has always been consistent in its efforts to ensure the effective implementation of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. As early as 1969, the Indonesian Government has promulgated regulations banning all trade with Southern Rhodesia. These regulations were reinforced last year when the Indonesian Minister of Trade issued regulation No. 342/Kp/IX'74, determining that imports from Mozambique must not only be subject to the usual import regulations but must also be accompanied by such documentation as set forth in the letter of the Secretary-General of the United Nations of 27 January 1971. With the issuance of these regulations, all imports suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin are subject to very close scrutiny and strict examination by the competent Indonesian authorities, in order to preclude, as much as possible, any kind of trade with Southern Rhodesia.

"In regard to the consignment of tobacco suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin aboard the Mexico Maru (Case 164), the Indonesian Government wishes, after having undertaken the necessary investigations, to confirm that the said consignment has indeed been imported into Indonesia by the import firm NV Nastiti. The consignment was accompanied by appropriated documentation, the authenticity of which the competent Indonesian authorities have no reason to doubt. Those documents, photocopies of which are herewith attached, certified that the aforementioned consignment of tobacco was not of Southern Rhodesian origin, but from Mozambique."

5. The documentary evidence submitted consisted of:

(a) A certificate issued by the Customs Service of Mozambique, Beira, on 2 November 1973, attesting to payments of 5 escudos (stamp duty) and 10,000 escudos (customs duty) in respect of 40,000 kg net weight of unprocessed tobacco;

(b) A railway dispatch certificate issued at Villa Perry on 29 October 1973, for the transportation of 200 cases (altogether 48,032 kg) of unprocessed tobacco from Villa Perry station to the port of Beira; and

(c) A certificate of origin issued at Beira on 2 November 1973, by the Department of Agriculture and Forests of Mozambique in respect of 200 cases (40,000 kg net, 48,032 kg gross weight) of unprocessed tobacco destined for Jakarta. It was pointed out to the Committee that the three certificates provided by the Government of Indonesia appeared to correspond exactly to the requirements stipulated in the Secretary-General's note of 27 July 1971 in respect of tobacco declared to originate in Mozambique.

6. At the 245th meeting on 31 July, the Committee considered the matter and decided to close the case, and notes dated 10 September 1975 were sent to Indonesia and Japan to that effect, also expressing the Committee's appreciation to those Governments for their co-operation in its inquiries.

(86) Case No. 169. Tobacco - "Adelaide Maru": United Kingdom note dated 5 April 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. At the 246th meeting on 28 May 1975, the Committee considered the matter and decided that in the light of the information and documentation supplied by Japan and Singapore, the case should be closed.

(87) Case No. 196. Tobacco - "Streefkerk" and "Swellendam": United Kingdom note dated 5 December 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 5 February 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"After having been informed by the Embassy of the United Kingdom in The Hague of the contents of the note dated 5 December 1974 addressed to the Security Council Committee, established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands authorities immediately conducted an investigation after the arrival of the MV Streefkerk at the port of Rotterdam.

"As a result of this inquiry, the matter has been referred to the District Attorney of Rotterdam. The Acting Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that he will be informed of the results of this investigation as soon as possible."

4. First reminders were sent to South Africa and Switzerland on 28 February 1975.
5. A note dated 2 April 1975 was sent to the Netherlands, under the no-objection procedure, inquiring whether the investigation by the District Attorney of Rotterdam had been completed and the result could be communicated to the Committee.
6. A reply dated 23 April 1975 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to communications of 17 December 1974 and 28 February 1975, in which the Secretary-General stated that the Security Council Committee ... would be very grateful if the Swiss Government could investigate the possibility that a Swiss company, Industria, AG, of Zurich, is acting as an agent for a Southern Rhodesian tobacco concern and has arranged for the shipment of tobacco suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"In response to that request, the Swiss authorities have contacted the management of Industria, AG, and have opened an investigation into this matter which has not yet been completed. The Swiss Government hopes, however, to be able soon to provide the Secretary-General with information on the results of its inquiries. The purpose of this communication is to inform the Committee of the action undertaken by the Swiss authorities pursuant to its request. In view of the investigation under way, the Permanent Observer of Switzerland hopes that the Committee will, in this

case, refrain from including the Swiss Government in the list which it publishes quarterly of Governments that have not replied within the prescribed two-month period to questions concerning possible violations of sanctions."

7. A second reminder was sent to South Africa on 30 May 1975.
8. Further to paragraph 5 above, a first reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 1 July 1975.
9. In the absence of replies from the Netherlands and South Africa, the Committee included those two countries in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.
10. Replies were received from Switzerland and the Netherlands, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 29 July 1975 from Switzerland

"Upon completion of the investigation carried out within the limits of the legal means at their disposal, the competent Federal authorities cannot conclude that the company Industria, AG, of Zurich was involved in the alleged transactions described by the United Kingdom authorities to the United Nations Committee on sanctions in their note of 5 December 1974.

"Industria, AG, which states that it is engaged, inter alia, in trade, in tobacco on a world-wide scale, denies categorically that it acts on behalf of the Transrhodesia Tobacco Company (PVT) Ltd., of Salisbury, that it has procured tobacco from that Rhodesian concern or that it has ever delivered Rhodesian tobacco to Swiss firms.

"As for transactions between Industria, AG, and third countries involving merchandise which does not enter Swiss territory, the Federal authorities reiterate that there is no legal means or procedure whereby they can intervene."

(ii) Note dated 1 August 1975 from the Netherlands

"The investigations concerning the MV Streefkerk, which were announced in this Mission's note No. 466 of 5 February 1975, have not yet been terminated. As had been promised in this Mission's aforementioned note, the results of this investigation shall be conveyed to the Secretary-General as soon as possible.

"As to the activities of the South African ship, the MV Swellendam, the investigations have revealed that this ship had arrived in Rotterdam on 5 December 1974 with a freight of approximately 45 tons of tobacco, consisting of 4 parts, of which 1 originated from Mozambique and the remaining 3 from Malawi.

"Furthermore it has come to the attention of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the Netherlands is mentioned in the quarterly list of July 1975 containing the names of Governments that have not responded substantially within the prescribed period of two months to an inquiry from the Committee. In this Mission's note No. 466 of 5 February 1975, the Secretary-General had been informed of the fact that a judicial investigation was being conducted, the results of which would be communicated as soon as possible.

"The reception of this note has been acknowledged by the Secretary-General's note dated 2 April 1975. It would, therefore, be appreciated to learn how it has been possible that the name of the Netherlands has been included in the aforementioned list and if a rectification of this situation can be brought about."

11. A third reminder was sent to South Africa on 6 October 1975.

12. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 251st meeting, a note dated 27 October 1975 was sent to the Netherlands under the no-objection procedure, requesting conclusive evidence, accompanied by copies of relevant documentation, that the tobacco unloaded off the MV "Swellendam" at Rotterdam was indeed from Malawi and Mozambique. The Committee pointed out, moreover, that with regard to the shipment aboard the MV Streefkerk a substantive reply was still awaited. As to the inclusion of the Netherlands in the quarterly list published on 13 July 1975, the Committee drew the attention of the Government to the procedure recommended in the Committee's second special report to the Security Council (S/10920, para. 18), which was approved by the Council in resolution 333 (1973) and had since become the basis for publishing such lists; in the absence of a substantive reply to the Committee's note of 2 April, and subsequent to a reminder sent of 1 July 1975, the Committee had been obliged to act in accordance with the established procedure.

13. A reply dated 31 October 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"By decision of the Arrondissementsrechtbank (district court) of Rotterdam dated 30 September 1975, the director of a Rotterdam firm of forwarding agents was sentenced to payment of a pecuniary fine, since he had imported for purposes of transit a consignment of tobacco of Southern Rhodesian origin transported to Rotterdam by the MV Streefkerk. However, the Rotterdam district attorney has appealed the sentence, since he could not agree with the court's decision not to impose an additional penalty.

"Since thus the sentence has not yet become final and without appeal, the Netherlands Government regrets not being able to supply further details at this moment. However, the Netherlands Government continues to give due attention to this matter and will not fail to give further information at the earliest possible moment to the Security Council Committee."

14. In the absence of a reply from South Africa, the Committee again included that Government in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

15. The Committee noted that the reply from the Netherlands indicated that there was a breach of sanctions by a Dutch importing firm. In accordance with its past practice in similar cases, the Committee decided to mention that fact in its proposed eighth annual report under the section dealing with actions taken by Governments with regard to specific violations of sanctions.

16. A further reply dated 8 December 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Netherlands Government regrets that it is not able to comply with the request of the Security Council Committee, called into being in conformity with the provisions of Security Council resolution 253, to deposit the documents pertaining to shipments of the MV Swellendam for inspection. These documents are business data which are the property of the Cape Continental Shipping Co. (PVT), Ltd., Cape Town, South Africa. For more precise details, if so desired, it is advised that the abovementioned South African company be approached directly.

"The Netherlands authorities have closely examined the documents regarding the shipment mentioned above. In this connection the Netherlands Government had no reason to believe that the goods originated from Southern Rhodesia.

"As to the question raised in relation to the MV Streefkerk, the Permanent Representative wishes to refer to his note to the Secretary-General No. 6860 dated 31 October 1975."

(88) Case No. 202. Tobacco - "M. Drammensfjord": United Kingdom note dated 6 March 1975

1. By a note dated 6 March 1975, the United Kingdom reported to the Committee information concerning a shipment of tobacco aboard the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a consignment of tobacco shipped to Norway was of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that the M. Drammensfjord was at the port of Beira at the end of October 1974, where she loaded a large consignment of tobacco of Rhodesian origin. Arrangements for the shipment of the tobacco were made between the Den Norske Amerikalinje A/S of Oslo, the owners of the vessel, and a Southern Rhodesia concern, Allen Wack and Shepherd (PVT) Ltd., of Salisbury. The M. Drammensfjord left Beira on

31 October 1974 and subsequently called at Oslo on or about 9 December 1974, where the tobacco was off-loaded.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Norway to assist them with their investigations into the carriage aboard a Norwegian-owned vessel of tobacco for delivery to Oslo and suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin. The Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to the documentary proof of origin recommended in his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 and to request the Government of Norway to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the tobacco was of non-Rhodesian origin."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 14 March 1975 was sent to Norway, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 17 April 1975, with copies of documentation enclosed, was received from Norway, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Norway to the United Nations ... has the honour to transmit copies of the following documentation:

1. Copy of certificate of origin No. 7581 issued by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi on 28 October 1974.

Copy of certificate of origin No. 7582 issued by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi on 28 October 1974.

Copy of certificate of origin No. 7598 issued by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi on 29 October 1974.

Copy of certificate of origin No. 7599 issued by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi on 29 October 1974.

Copy of certificate of origin No. 10954 issued by the Tobacco Control Commission of Malawi on 29 July 1974.

Copy of servico de exportacao issued by Direccao Provincial dos Servicos de Commercio on 9 October 1974.

2. Copy of combined certificate of origin and arrival at and exportation from the port of Beira T.C.C. Nos. 11166/67-5/9 issued by the British Consulate on 5 September 1974.

Copy of combined certificate of origin and arrival at and exportation from the port of Beira T.C.C. Nos. 11302/03-4/10 issued by the British Consulate on 7 October 1974.

3. Copy of bill of lading No. 1 of 30 October 1974.
Copy of bill of lading No. 2 of 30 October 1974.
Copy of bill of lading No. 3 of 30 October 1974.
Copy of bill of lading No. 4 of 30 October 1974.
4. Copy of manifest of cargo of 25 October 1974.
Copy of manifest of cargo of 25 October 1974.
Copy of manifest of cargo of 30 October 1974.

"The documentation set forth above shows that the tobacco in question is of non-Rhodesian origin."

4. The documentation submitted by Norway was summarized by the export consultant in six tables as follows: tables 1, 2 and 3 represented a summary of three different kinds of certificates of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce and Industries of Malawi, the Tobacco Control Commission of Malawi and the Direccão Provincial dos Servicos de Comercio, respectively; two combined certificates of origin and arrival at and exportation from, the port of Beira, issued by the British Consulate in Beira were summarized in table 4 (the British Consulate documents covered the shipments given in table 1 only); the information given in the four bills of lading was similar to that furnished by the Scandinavian East Africa Line in the manifest of cargo dated 30 October 1974 and the two kinds of documentation were summarized in table 5 (the shipments shown in that table were similar to those given in tables 1, 2 and 3), and table 6 summarized two manifests of cargo dated 25 October 1974 issued by the Scandinavian East Africa Line (no other supporting documentation for the information given in table 6 was submitted by the Norwegian Government).

(89) Case No. 207. Imports of tobacco by Belgian firm: United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1975

1. By a note dated 3 July 1975 the United Kingdom reported information concerning imports of tobacco by a Belgium tobacco firm. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a Belgian company is engaged in trade in Rhodesian tobacco.

"The information is to the effect that a Belgian company, G. Van Onacker and Zoon of Geraardsbergen, is engaged in trade with a Southern Rhodesian company, The Africa Leaf Tobacco of Rhodesia, Ltd., Salisbury. The Belgian company not only imports tobacco on its own account from the Southern Rhodesian company but also acts as a European agent of Africa Leaf Tobacco. In March or April 1975, Mr. Christopher Van Onacker, a partner in the Belgian company, visited Southern Rhodesia at the time of the 1975 tobacco auctions. He had meetings subsequently with Africa Leaf Tobacco in Salisbury to arrange for the disposal in Europe of tobacco purchased at the auctions.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Belgium in order to assist them with their investigations into:

- (a) The reason for Mr. C. Van Onacker's visit to Africa Leaf Tobacco in Salisbury;
- (b) The possibility that G. Van Onacker and Zoon is importing tobacco of Rhodesian origin into Belgium from the Africa Leaf Tobacco of Rhodesia, Ltd.;
- (c) The possibility that the Belgium company is acting as a European agent for the Africa Leaf Tobacco of Rhodesia, Ltd."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 22 July 1975 was sent to Belgium, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A first reminder was sent to Belgium on 1 October 1975.

4. In the absence of a reply from Belgium, the Committee included that Government in the eighth quarterly list which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

5. A second reminder was sent to Belgium on 6 November 1975.

6. A reply dated 12 December 1975 was received from Belgium, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Annexed to your first note was 'information' transmitted to the Committee on sanctions by the United Kingdom. I have duly transmitted your note and the annex thereto to my Government which has authorized me to inform you of the following.

"In general, when dealing with the Committee on sanctions, the Belgian Government would like to receive the most detailed information possible in order to enable it to arrange effectively for the necessary inquiry.

"In the case in question, the United Kingdom, which has provided 'information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation', gives only vague information about a visit to Southern Rhodesia which Mr. Van Onacker is alleged to have made 'in March or April 1975'.

"It would be useful for my Government to know the exact date of that visit, which the United Kingdom must know, since it claims that it took place. Such information, if sufficiently precise, would provide an initial indication that the Belgian firm Van Onacker might be conducting business

with Southern Rhodesia. For its part, my Government is bound to respect the freedom of movement of its nationals, and does not keep records of their journeys abroad; still less is it able to prevent such journeys, or to ascertain their aims and motives, as requested in paragraph (a) of the British note.

"Furthermore, the Belgian Government would like to have all the information which the United Kingdom must have at its disposal for it to be able to suggest that the firm Van Onacker has concluded agreements with a Southern Rhodesian firm granting it some degree of monopoly in Europe for the importation of Rhodesian tobacco. My Government is not satisfied with the statements in the British note, which are extremely vague about the nature, date and place of the alleged transactions.

"In its present form, therefore, the evidence provided in the United Kingdom note does not enable my Government to conduct an inquiry to establish whether it is well-founded.

"My Government will nevertheless keep this case open, and would like the Committee on sanctions to provide it with any additional information which might be obtained from the United Kingdom."

D. CEREALS e/

(90) Case No. 18. Trade in maize: United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(91) Case No. 39. Maize - "Fraternity": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(92) Case No. 44. Maize - "Galini": United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(93) Case No. 47. Maize - "Santa Alexandra": United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(94) Case No. 49. Maize - "Zeno": United Kingdom note dated 26 September 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Liberia, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.

4. For further information concerning this case see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included that Government in the seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(95) Case No. 56. Maize - "Julia L": United Kingdom note dated 13 November 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

e/ See also (66) Case No. 140, above.

(96) Case No. 63. Maize - "Polyxene C.": United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(97) Case No. 90. Maize - "Virgy": United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(98) Case No. 91. Maize - "Master Daskalos": United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the sixth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(99) Case No. 97. Maize - "Lambros M. Fatsis": United Kingdom note dated 30 September 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the fourth report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
4. For further information concerning this case see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.
5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Panama in the seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(100) Case No. 106. Maize - "Corviglia": United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(101) Case No. 124. Maize - "Armonía": United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Venezuela, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.

4. For further information concerning this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Venezuela in the seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(102) Case No. 125. Maize - "Alexandros S": United Kingdom note dated 23 September 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Venezuela, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.

4. For further information concerning this case see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Venezuela in the seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(103) Case No. 139. Maize - "Pythia": United Kingdom note dated 6 April 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Liberia, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth, seventh and eighth quarterly lists issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

E. COTTON AND COTTON SEED

- (104) Case No. 53. Cotton seed - "Holly Trader": United Kingdom note dated 23 October 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

- (105) Case No. 96. Cotton - "S.A. Statesman": United Kingdom note dated 14 September 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

F. MEAT

- (106) Case No. 8. Meat - "Kaapland": United Kingdom note dated 10 March 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (107) Case No. 13. Meat - "Zuiderkerk": United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (108) Case No. 14. Beef - "Tabora": United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (109) Case No. 16. Beef - "Tugelaland": United Kingdom note dated 16 June 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (110) Case No. 22. Beef - "Swellendam": United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

- (111) Case No. 33. Meat - "Taveta": United Kingdom note dated 8 August 1969

See annex IV.

- (112) Case No. 42. Meat - "Polona": United Kingdom note dated 17 September 1969

See annex IV.

(113) Case No. 61. Chilled meat: United Kingdom note dated 8 December 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(114) Case No. 68. Pork - "Alcor": United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(115) Case No. 117. Frozen meat - "Drymakos": United Kingdom note dated 21 April 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(116) Case No. 183. Trade in meat and banking facilities: United Kingdom note dated 25 June 1974

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

G. SUGAR

(117) Case No. 28. Sugar - "Byzantine Monarch": United Kingdom note dated 21 July 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fourth report.

2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(118) Case No. 60. Sugar - "Filotis": United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(119) Case No. 65. Sugar - "Eleni": United Kingdom note dated 5 January 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(120) Case No. 72. Sugar - "Lavrentios": United Kingdom note dated 8 April 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(121) Case No. 83. Sugar - "Angelia": United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(122) Case No. 94. Sugar - "Philomila": United Kingdom note dated 28 August 1970

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth, seventh and eighth quarterly lists which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(123) Case No. 112. Sugar - "Evangelos M": United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

(124) Case No. 115. Sugar - "Aegean Mariner": United Kingdom note dated 19 March 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
4. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.
5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Panama in the seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(125) Case No. 119. Sugar - "Calli": United Kingdom note dated 10 May 1971

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(126) Case No. 122. Sugar - "Netanya": United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1971

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

(127) Case No. 126. Sugar - "Netanya": United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1971

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

(128) Case No. 128. Sugar - "Netanya": United Kingdom note dated 11 February 1972

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

(129) Case No. 131. Sugar - "Mariner": United Kingdom note dated 12 April 1972

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

(130) Case No. 132. Sugar - "Primrose": United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1972

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. In the absence of a reply from Liberia, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth, seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(131) Case No. 147. Sugar - "Anangel Ambition": United Kingdom note dated 27 June 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.

H. FERTILIZERS AND AMMONIA

(132) Case No. 2. Import of manufactured fertilizers from Europe: United Kingdom note dated 14 January 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(133) Case No. 48. Ammonia - "Butaneuve": United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(134) Case No. 52. Bulk ammonia: United Kingdom notes dated 15 October and 10 November 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(135) Case No. 66. Ammonia - "Cérons": United Kingdom note dated 7 January 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(136) Case No. 69. Ammonia - "Mariotte": United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(137) Case No. 101. Anhydrous ammonia: United States note dated 12 October 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(138) Case No. 113. Anhydrous ammonia - "Cypress" and "Isfonn": United Kingdom note dated 29 January 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. At the 245th meeting on 31 July 1975, the Committee considered the text of the draft note proposed for transmittal to the Governments whose nationals had been mentioned in the reply from Switzerland dated 2 October 1974. At that meeting the Committee decided to request the Secretariat to find out as much information as possible about the firm Nitrex, AG., of Zurich, which dealt in fertilizers.

4. On 3 September 1975 the Secretariat submitted to the Committee a report on Nitrex, AG. The text of that report is reproduced below.

"1. The name of the company Nitrex, AG., has already appeared in the files of the Committee (Case No. 2), and some information on it was reported to the Security Council in 1969 (second report S/9252/Add.1, annex XI B). Moreover, in 1970 a note concerning the trade in fertilizers entitled

'Note on imports of ammonia into Southern Rhodesia as a basic element for fertilizers' was prepared at the request of the Committee and incorporated in the fourth report (S/10229, annex V).

"2. That note stated in particular that, since about 1968, the Rhodesian importers of fertilizers had been required by the illegal régime to obtain their supplies through one channel, a company set up specifically to co-ordinate the evasion of trade sanctions. That company, called UNIVEX, sent orders to a Swiss company, Nitrex, AG., of Zurich, which in turn placed orders with individual manufacturers in Europe.

"3. That information was sent to all Member States and members of the specialized agencies. It appeared from the replies received that Nitrex was a sales company in which European exporters of nitrogeneous fertilizers had joined together. Most of the Governments concerned indicated in their communications that appropriate steps had been taken against possible violations of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia. Switzerland, however, stated that while the Nitrex company was registered in the city of Zurich, most of its capital was in foreign hands; that, moreover, the fertilizers were not manufactured in Switzerland and would not enter the Swiss customs area even in transit; and that, accordingly, the Swiss authorities had no way in law or even in practice of proceeding against Nitrex, AG.

"4. It may be recalled in that connexion that the reply from Switzerland raised the question of the responsibility of States regarding sanctions violations by their nationals abroad. The Committee requested an advice from the Legal Counsel on that matter which was specifically reported to the Security Council in chapter VI of the sixth report (S/11178/Rev.1, paras. 134-138).

"5. Concerning the Nitrex company, that name appears in one reference book, i.e., Who Owns Whom, Continental edition, 1974-1975, volume I. The entry is as follows: 'Name of subsidiary or company in association with other companies: Nitrex AG., (A), Zurich; name of parent company or associate: BASF AG., Federal Republic of Germany. Also another Nitrex AG., (A) company is referred to, with the company Chemie Linz AG., Austria, given as the name of the parent company or associate.

"6. No further reference could be found on Nitrex in any other reference book. It may be noted in particular that the publication Jane's Major Companies of Europe 1974 does not mention it, even in connexion with the company BASF, AG., referred to above; although it indicates, among many other principal subsidiaries and participations of BASF, a BASF Holding AG., in Zurich."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision taken at the 245th meeting, notes were sent on 26 and 29 September 1975 to all the Governments concerned except

Switzerland, i.e., Austria, Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Norway, with reference to their respective nationals whom Switzerland had indicated as being members of the board of Nitrex.

6. The substantive part of that note, which was adopted by the Committee under the no-objection procedure, is reproduced below.

"During its consideration of cases of suspected violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, the Committee has come across instances where certain firms registered in and operating from Switzerland have been involved in transactions connected with some of those cases. In reply to the Committee's inquiries, the Government of Switzerland has always maintained that it has no legal means of controlling the activities of its firms conducted outside Swiss juridical territory. This matter was the subject of a note addressed to all Governments by the Secretary-General on 29 October 1973, at the Committee's request, a copy of which is herewith enclosed for ease of reference.

"The Committee has now received further information from the Government of Switzerland to the effect that one of the firms involved, Nitrex, AG., registered in Zurich, Switzerland, in 1962, is managed by a board of directors of various nationalities that includes Mr. /Messrs./ _____, who is also given as a national /who are also given as nationals/ of _____. The firm was set up by a number of fertilizer manufacturers from various European countries and in 1969 was reported to be involved in transactions facilitating the purchase of manufactured fertilizers in Europe for transportation to Mozambique, whence they were suspected to be finally destined for Southern Rhodesia.

"At its 245th meeting, the Committee decided that this information should be brought to the attention of His Excellency's Government, pointing out that a national /nationals/ of _____ might be involved in the management of a company whose activities might be contrary to the provisions of Security Council resolutions establishing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"In view of the position taken by the Government of Switzerland, the Committee expressed the hope that His Excellency's Government might be in a position to bring influence upon its national(s) on the company's board of directors, so that he /they/ in turn might eventually restrain the company from activities that appear to be in contravention of the Security Council decisions.

"Regarding the companies which may be involved in Nitrex activities directly or indirectly, the Committee thought that His Excellency's Government might wish to conduct an investigation on exports made to southern Africa in order to determine whether any of them may have reached Southern Rhodesia. Any information on this matter, including the names of the companies involved, would be of great help to the work of the Committee.

"Finally, the Committee expressed the hope that the Government would find it possible to provide its comments on the case at its earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

7. The notes to Austria and the Federal Republic of Germany contained supplementary paragraphs inserted after the penultimate paragraph as follows:

Austria. "In that connexion, the Committee noted that in the reference book Who Owns Whom, continental edition, 1974-1975, volume I, a company Nitrex was mentioned as follows: name of subsidiary or company in association with other companies: Nitrex AG., (A); name of parent company or associate: Chemie Linz AG., Austria."

Federal Republic of Germany. "In that connexion, the Committee recalled that in its note dated 11 March 1969 addressed to the Secretary-General (ref. III B 5-84/90.05 and reproduced in the second report of the Committee, S/9252/Add.1, annex XI B, para. 4), the Federal Republic confirmed that the firms BASF and Farwerke Hoechst, AG., were among the co-owners of Nitrex, AG., Zurich, but pointed out that no deliveries had taken place in the framework of Nitrex after the entry into force of the 13th ordinance to amend the foreign trade regulations of 9 November 1968."

8. An acknowledgement dated 1 October 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

9. A reply dated 4 November 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Netherlands Government goes to great pains to guarantee that in the Netherlands the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia are closely observed. To every request of the sanctions Committee to investigate alleged violations of the sanctions by Dutch companies or Dutch citizens, the closest attention is paid. Therefore, the Netherlands Government regrets that it cannot investigate the issue raised by the sanctions Committee for the following reason.

"It is the Netherlands' opinion that in the present case the question under discussion is not the issue which was at the centre of the previous history, namely, that a State 'should take the necessary measures to ensure that firms established in and operating from their territories will not by means of activities conducted abroad, violate the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia established by the relevant Security Council decisions' (reference PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) Case No. 113 of 29 October 1973).

"The present case does not concern a company established on its own territory, but a firm set up abroad and operating from there, of which firm one of the functionaries has the Netherlands nationality. The Netherlands Government does not believe it is up to it to try and restrict the activities of a foreign enterprise by exercising its influence on a Dutch citizen who is on the board of directors of that enterprise.

"Furthermore, the sanctions Committee mentions that the above foreign company had been involved in 1969 in transactions facilitating the purchase of manufactured fertilizers in Europe for transportation to Mozambique and presently asks the Netherlands Government for an investigation on exports made to southern Africa in order to determine whether any of them may have reached Southern Rhodesia. Even if Dutch nationals had been involved in these reported transactions, an investigation would have been impossible because of the few substantial data and the fact that time and place of possible action are long time past."

10. First reminders were sent to Austria, Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Norway on 9 December 1975.

11. A reply dated 12 December 1975 was received from Belgium, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I had already brought to the attention of the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs the information which you at that time asked me to transmit in connexion with this case. The Belgian authorities then called upon the competent Departments to pursue the matter.

"At the current stage of the inquiry which has been ordered, I am able to provide you with the following information.

"In general, the Belgian Government can exercise authority only over companies registered under Belgian law and foreign companies which have registered offices or operate in Belgium. In the case in question, your aforementioned note refers to the firm Nitrex, which, as it was registered in Zurich in 1962, is therefore presumed to be subject to Swiss law; consequently, the Belgian authorities have no information about this firm or any means of acquiring such information.

"It would therefore be advisable to consult the Swiss authorities on this point and make inquiries about the composition of the board of directors and, if need be, about the identity and nationality of its members.

"Moreover, the Belgian Government cannot be held responsible for the activities of its nationals abroad. At the most, it could intervene unofficially and informally if its nationals abroad took part in illegal activities punishable in Belgium.

"For that reason, as they are anxious to study thoroughly the matter on which the request in your aforementioned note was based the Belgian authorities have made every effort to identify Mr. Raymond Becker who, according to your information, might be a Belgian national on the board of directors of the firm Nitrex.

"As they only know the first name and surname of the person concerned and have no other information, the competent authorities in the Belgian Administration have not succeeded in identifying a national who would fit the hypothetical description contained in your aforementioned note.

"In that connexion, my Government would be grateful if the Committee on sanctions once it has identified this Belgian national, located his head office and obtained information on the nature of his activities, would transmit to it all the information it has obtained, as without such information the Belgian Government could not pursue its investigations effectively."

(139) Case No. 123. Anhydrous ammonia - "Zion": United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth, seventh and eighth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

(140) Case No. 129. Anhydrous ammonia - "Kristian Birkeland": United Kingdom note dated 24 February 1972

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(141) Case No. 204. Import of agricultural crop chemical by Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 13 March 1975

1. By a note dated 13 March 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning efforts by Southern Rhodesian firms to import agricultural crop chemicals for the year 1975-1976. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received reliable information that chemical companies in Southern Rhodesia are actively seeking to import large quantities of agricultural crop chemicals for the year 1975-1976.

"The information is to the effect that the chemical companies concerned urgently require a substantial number of chemical compounds many of which are of vital importance in the production of tobacco or cotton. The chemical compounds and quantities required are as follows:

1,500 tonnes	of	ethylene dibromide (EDB)
300	"	" DDT granular
800	"	" DDT 75 per cent WP
450	"	" methyl bromide
365	"	" atrazine
1,800	"	" carbaryl (sevin)
75	"	" bladex
40	"	" fluometuron (cotoran)
56	"	" planarin (nitralin)
120,000 litres	"	" dimethioate
900,000	"	" endoslyphan
150,000	"	" trifluralin
180,000	"	" chloropyrifos

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of all Member States so that they may take effective action to prevent the export, either directly or through a third country, to Southern Rhodesia of any of the chemicals listed above which may be manufactured or processed in their territories.

"The Committee may further wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the particular attention of Member States to Southern Rhodesia's requirement for ethylene dibromide. This chemical is used to protect tobacco against attack from root-knot eelworm, which can cause considerable damage to the crop. The absence of the chemical would therefore be likely to reduce the yield of the Southern Rhodesian tobacco crop."

- In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 229th meeting, a note was sent to all Member States on 26 March 1975, transmitting the United Kingdom note and drawing the particular attention of the Governments to the last two paragraphs of that note.
- Acknowledgements were received from Japan (1 April 1975), the Federal Republic of Germany (3 April 1975) and Canada (11 April 1975).
- Replies were also received from Austria and Greece, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 12 June 1975 from Austria

"Most of the agricultural crop chemicals listed in the note of the United Kingdom of 13 March 1975 are produced in Austria only under licence agreements. Therefore, these chemicals are either not exported at all or exported only in insignificant quantities. However, the competent Austrian authorities have warned all producers of the listed chemicals not to export these either directly or indirectly to Southern Rhodesia."

(ii) Note dated 21 July 1975 from Greece

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to communicate that competent authorities in Greece were properly instructed to avoid any transaction with companies from South Rhodesia, seeking importation of agricultural chemical products in their country.

"In this connexion, two communications issued by the Ministries of Mercantile Marine and Trade, respectively are attached hereto."

Texts of the enclosures

(a) Letter dated 19 May 1975 from the Ministry of Mercantile Marine, Civil Navigation, General Directorate, distributed as indicated below

Subject: Sanctions against Southern Rhodesia - Importation of agricultural chemical products in Southern Rhodesia

Relevant: (a) Our 50728/2/69/18.10.1969
(b) Our 50145/5/72/2.8.1972
(c) Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 7D.F6152.61/23/AS 1332/30.4.1975
(not addressed to you).

1. Further to above, relevant under (a) and (b), we have the honour to communicate to you attached hereto in a photocopy notification PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 26 March 1975 of the United Nations Secretary-General, along with the relevant attached thereto, in respect to the above question.

2. As you will see by yourselves, the British Government denounced to the Special Committee for the embargo on Southern Rhodesia that Southern Rhodesian companies make every effort to import into Southern Rhodesia of certain agricultural chemical products.

3. As a result, the United Nations Secretary-General, acting by order of the above Committee, draws the attention of Member countries of the Organization, to avoid any and all transactions with the aforesaid companies.

4. Bringing the foregoing to your notice, and in correlation with the contents of your documents (a) and (b) above, we would request you to inform suitably your members to refrain from carrying out transports by Greek ships of the products referred to in the above notification, which would complicate still more this already very intricate question.

5. In the light of what precedes, we would request you to bear in mind that any case denounced, for which there is evidence of transgression of the provisions of Compulsory Law 540/1968, whereby Compulsory Law 95/1967, re: "prohibition of transactions with Southern Rhodesia", was amended and completed, must be referred to the competent Public Prosecutor's Office for the imposition of the lawful sanctions

against those responsible, the sanctions for whom are provided for by Compulsory Law 92/1967 (Official Gazette of the Government, Folio No. 139/A/10.8.1967), re: "application of decisions of the United Nations Security Council, and approval and application of recommendations of the Security Council and of the General Assembly". As responsible for such transgressions are understood: the shipowner, the charterer, the administrator, the agent, and the ship's captain.

By order of the Minister
The Secretary-General
Ph. Chrimatopoulos

Attached: photocopies two (2).

Table of distribution:

I. Receivers for action:

1. Marine Chamber of Greece
2. Union of Greek Shipowners
3. Hellenic Committee of Maritime Co-operation, London.
4. Union of Shipowners of Mediterranean cargo boats.
5. Panhellenic Union of Mercantile Marine Captains of all categories.
6. Shipping Brokers and Agents Institution, 1 Skouze Street, Piraeus.

II. Receivers for communication in respect to relevant under (c) above.

1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Second General Directorate
7th Direction of Economic Affairs
2. Ministry of Trade
Trade General Directorate
Exportations Trade Direction
3. Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations
69 East 79th Street

III. Inter-office distribution:

ALS/DAP - 3 with copy of relevant and attachments to same.

S/S E. Beinoglou

(b) Letter dated 26 May 1975 from the Ministry of Trade, General Directorate, addressed as indicated below

To: All Prefectures of the State
Trade Directions and Depts.
Bank of Greece, Exportations Service
All Committees of Control of Exportation Invoices

Copies: As per Table of Distribution

Subject: Prohibition of transactions with Southern Rhodesia

We have the honour to communicate to you the following:

We remind you that, as from March 1966, trade relations of our country with Southern Rhodesia have been prohibited, whereas, by Compulsory Laws 95/1967 and 540/1968, a further ban was imposed on transactions with said country.

We were informed that Southern Rhodesian companies are making every effort in this respect for the importation in Southern Rhodesia of certain agricultural chemical products.

In view of what precedes, and with the end in view of avoiding entanglement of Greek companies in this question, we would ask you to take due care within your jurisdiction for strict adherence to the provisions of the laws mentioned above.

The Panhellenic Exporters Association and the Association of Greek Industrialists, to whom the present is being communicated, are requested to inform accordingly all their members.

By order of the minister:

Table of Distribution:

Ministry of Foreign Affairs in re: 7D.F6152.61/23/AS 1332
Panhellenic Exporters Association, Athens
Association of Greek Industrialists, Athens

Inter-office distribution:

Minister's office
Under-Secretary's office
General Secretary's office
Trade General Director's office
Bilateral Trade Agreements Direction
Importations Direction
First Exportations Trade Direction (3)
Second Exportations Trade Direction

SS. E. Beinoglou

I. MACHINERY

(142) Case No. 50. Tractor kits: United Kingdom note dated 2 October 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(143) Case No. 58. Book-keeping and accounting machines: Italian note dated 6 November 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(144) Case No. 161. Electric generating equipment: United Kingdom note dated 3 December 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 239th meeting on 29 May 1975, the Committee considered the matter and decided that the case should be closed.

(145) Case No. 170. Spare parts for sewing or knitting machines - "Elceland": United Kingdom note dated 10 April 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 10 January 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"A non-appealable fine of DM 5,000.00 has been imposed on the Company of Gebr. Scheller, Eislingen.

"The investigations into the business relations of this firm also produced indications of such relations with Southern Rhodesia on the part of at least one other firm. The investigations are, therefore, being continued. The Secretary-General will be advised promptly of any new developments."

4. A further reply dated 27 June 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive portion of which reads as follows:

"Further investigations conducted in the meantime by the competent German authorities disclosed that two other companies were involved. The examination revealed that merchandise worth about DM 13,000.00 (two used

knitting machines, spare parts and equipment for the textile industry) have been exported via South Africa and Mozambique to Southern Rhodesia. The firms will be fined several thousand Deutsch Mark each."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 246th meeting, a note dated 12 September 1975 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, under the no-objection procedure, expressing the Committee's appreciation for the action taken by the Government in the matter leading to the conviction and punishment of the guilty firms involved; the note also inquired if the Federal Government had any additional information on the circumstances in which the illegal consignments had reached their destinations, including, if possible, the names of any intermediaries that might have been involved in the transactions.

6. An acknowledgement dated 17 September 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

7. A reply dated 6 October 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany has been received, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The endeavours of the Federal Government to obtain further information in compliance with the request of the Secretary-General's note have not brought to light any new findings. As already stated in this Mission's note of 19 June 1974, most of the consignments were addressed to Messrs. Watson Shipping, Ltd., Port Elizabeth, South Africa, while others had been sent to their destination via Messrs. Watson Shipping, Ltd., Beira, Mozambique and Messrs. Diana Dresses, Ltd., Johannesburg, South Africa."

(146) Case No. 177. Machine tools: United Kingdom note dated 4 June 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 241st meeting on 19 June 1975, the Committee considered the matter and decided that the Chairman should orally inform the representative of Italy in the Committee, as well as the Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations, of the Committee's appreciation for the co-operation of their Governments in its inquiries and of its decision at that meeting to close the case.

(147) Case No. 189. Wankie power station: United Kingdom note dated 9 September 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. A reply dated 20 December 1974 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, informing the Committee that "the competent authorities were not able to proceed with their investigations because the information required for tracing the Steinmüller concern has not yet been made available".

4. On 27 February 1975, the following information, found in Europe's Largest Companies 1972, published by the Noyes Data Corporation, Noyes Building, Park Ridge, New Jersey (USA), was verbally communicated to the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Steinmüller (L. and C.) GMBH
5270 Gummersbach 1
Postfach 1949/1960
mechanical engineering

5. A reply dated 30 April 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigations conducted by the competent German authorities are to the effect that a South African concern by the name of Steinmüller did, in fact, lodge a tender for the construction of a power station in Southern Rhodesia but has not been awarded a contract. As regards the German firm L. and C. Steinmüller in Gummersbach the investigations have not yielded any evidence that this concern is involved in a contract designated as 'Project 10'."

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 247th meeting, a note dated 24 September 1975 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below:

"The Secretary-General of the United Nations ... at the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, has the honour to refer to the Permanent Representative's note of 30 April 1975 and to earlier correspondence regarding the possibility that a firm named 'Steinmüller' has contracted to build a power station on the Wankie coalfield in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee would be grateful to receive further information from His Excellency's Government in this matter. Specifically, the Committee wishes to know whether:

"(a) There is any relationship between the German firm, L. and C. Steinmüller in Gummersbach, and the South African concern by the name of Steinmüller; for example, whether the South African concern is a subsidiary or a representative of the German firm;

"(b) The German firm, L. and C. Steinmüller, has any connexion with the possible construction of a power station on the Wankie coalfield or at any other location in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee also indicated that it would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter at the earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

7. An acknowledgement dated 30 September 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

8. A reply dated 22 October 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"According to information from the competent authorities in the Federal Republic of Germany, the German firm L. and C. Steinmüller is a shareholder of the independent South African company Steinmüller. Both firms maintain business relations. As regards the construction of a power station on the Wankie coalfield, no German supplies have been intended at any time. Neither has an investigation in the offices of the firm L. and C. Steinmüller in Gummersbach brought to light any business relations with Southern Rhodesia."

(148) Case No. 209. Rolling mill rolls: United Kingdom note dated 6 June 1975

1. By a note dated 6 June 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning the supply of rolling mill rolls to Southern Rhodesia. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information, of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation, that an Austrian company has arranged to supply rolling mill rolls to Southern Rhodesia.

The information is to the effect that an Austrian company, Eisenwerk Sulzau-Werfen of PO Box 501, A-1041 Vienna, has arranged to supply rolling mill rolls to Southern Rhodesia. Payment for the rolling mill rolls, amounting to approximately 600,000 Austrian schillings, will be made by a Southern Rhodesian bank, possibly through intermediary banking channels, to the Austrian company's account with the Credit-Institut Aktiengesellschaft of 12 Herrengasse A1013, Vienna. In order to disguise the ultimate destination of the rolling mill rolls, Eisenwerk Sulzau-Werfen consigned them in the first instance to a South African company, Rennies Consolidated, Pty, Ltd, PO Box 506, Port Elizabeth.

The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above

information to the attention of the Government of Austria in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Eisenwerk Sulzau-Werfen has arranged to supply rolling mill rolls to Southern Rhodesia."

In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the notification procedure, a note dated 19 June 1975 was sent to Austria, transmitting United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reply dated 1 September 1975 was received from Austria, the substantive of which reads as follows:

"Investigations carried out by the competent Austrian authorities upon request of the above-mentioned note have shown that the Austrian company Eisenwerk Sulzau-Werfen has maintained for a number of years numerous business contacts with clients in the Republic of South Africa. Among others rolling mill equipment is supplied to South Africa within the framework of these business contacts.

"The case taken up in the note of the United Kingdom to the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) mentioning an amount of approximately 600,000 Austrian schillings probably concerns two shipments of rolling mill rolls valued at 431,120 schillings and 174,240 schillings respectively. These shipments were dispatched to the South African firm Non-Ferrous Distributors, 30 Melle Street, Braamfontein, Johannesburg, c/o Rennies Consolidated (Pty.), Ltd., Port Elizabeth, in the Republic of South Africa. The export earnings are credited by order of the firm Non-Ferrous Distributors to the account of the Austrian company Eisenwerk Sulzau-Werfen at their bank Oesterreichisches Kreditinstitut, A.G., Vienna.

"The Federal Government of Austria hopes that this case has been sufficiently clarified by the above information. Should there be any further questions, however, it is ready to fully co-operate with the Committee."

1) Case No. 221. Supply of electrical equipment: United Kingdom note dated 1 September 1975

By a note dated 1 September 1975 the United Kingdom reported information concerning the supply of electrical equipment to Southern Rhodesia. The text of note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation which suggests that a Belgian company is trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that a Belgian company, Electrothermil Philips-ACEC, SA, of Herstal, Belgium, is supplying on a regular

basis items of electrical equipment, including transformers and capacitors, to a Southern Rhodesian company, Morewear Industries (Rhod) (PVT), Ltd., Salisbury.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Belgium so as to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that the firm of Electrothermil Philips-ACEC, SA, is supplying electrical equipment to Southern Rhodesia."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 17 September 1975 was sent to Belgium, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A first reminder was sent to Belgium on 4 December 1975.

J. TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT

Motor vehicles and/or motor-vehicle spares

(150) Case No. 9. Motor vehicles: United States note dated 28 March 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

(151) Case No. 145. Trucks, engines etc.: information obtained from published sources

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(152) Case No. 168. Motor vehicles or spare parts - "Straat Rio": United Kingdom note dated 15 March 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. A reply dated 27 December 1974 (also covering Case No. 180) was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The inquiries made by the Netherlands authorities into this question led to the conclusion that the Straat Rio, which is owned by the Koninklijke Java Pakketvaartlijnen, N.V., has indeed carried two shipments of motor cars and motor-car spares from Yokohama and Nagoya to the port of Beira in

December 1973 and March 1974, respectively. According to the bills of lading covering the shipments, the motor cars, as well as the spare parts, were destined for companies in Malawi and Mozambique. Having regard to the contents of those documents, there was no basis for the shipping company in question to refuse the transportation of the shipments.

"With regard to the request contained in the above-mentioned note of the Secretary-General of 16 August to receive copies of the documentation on which the investigating authorities based their findings, the Acting Permanent Representative wishes to reiterate the position of the Netherlands Government that, to its regret, it is unable to comply with the request because of the fact that the documentation requested by the Secretary-General constitutes company data belonging to the shipping company concerned. Under the law of the Netherlands, private enterprises cannot be compelled to make public such data."

4. A reply dated 18 February 1975 was received from Burundi, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The shipment of cars loaded at the port of Nagoya for Burundi was in fact recorded on its arrival at Bujumbura by the Toyota representative, Mr. Maurice Verckmons. The four vehicles were the subject of orders Nos. 143 and 144, placed by the said representative under his credit No. 36,621."

5. A second reminder was sent to Zambia on 28 February 1975.

6. In the absence of a reply from Zambia, the Committee included that Government in the sixth and seventh quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 13 March and 10 July 1975, respectively.

7. At the 247th meeting on 4 September 1975, the Committee decided that, in accordance with the standard procedure, a third reminder should be sent to Zambia. Meanwhile, the Chairman would contact the Permanent Mission of Zambia on the matter and would also request the representative of the Organization of African Unity to use his good offices with a view to obtaining the necessary information from Zambia. That decision also covered Cases Nos. 173 and 180.

8. Accordingly, a third reminder was sent to Zambia on 12 September 1975.

9. At the 252nd meeting on 16 October, the Chairman informed the Committee that, in pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 247th meeting, he had personally approached the representative of Zambia and requested him to endeavour to secure an early reply on the matter; the representative of Zambia had taken note of the request.

10. Further to paragraph 6 above, the Committee again included Zambia in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

(153) Case No. 173. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "Daphne":
United Kingdom note dated 16 May 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. First reminders were sent to Malawi, Portugal and Zambia on 28 February 1975.
4. A reply dated 6 March 1975 (which also covers Case No. 180) was received from Malawi, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent authorities in Malawi advised that all the vehicles destined for the Malawi market were disposed of locally and those for Zambia had been transported on to that country through the Mchinji/Chipata border."

5. In the absence of replies from Portugal and Zambia, the Committee included those Governments in the sixth quarterly list issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
6. Second reminders were sent to Portugal and Zambia on 11 April 1975.
7. A reply dated 8 May 1975 was received from Portugal (also partly covering Case No. 182), the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"1. With respect to the ship Citadel, cargo manifest number 374/74, it appears that 40 automobiles, 150 wagons and 10 buses (all Toyota) were sent to Mobil Motors, Lusaka, Zambia, by the local firm, Mitchell Cotts and Co., S.A., in care of Mobil Motors Limited, Blantyre, Malawi, P.O. Box 430; 17 automobiles and 6 wagons were shipped to Mobil Motors, Blantyre, Malawi, Box 430.

"2. With respect to the ship 'Daphne', cargo manifest number 291/74, it appears that 48 automobiles, 106 wagons and 3 buses were sent to Mobil Motors, Lusaka, Zambia; 11 automobiles, 8 wagons and 1 bus to Mobil Motors, Blantyre, Malawi, P.O. Box 430; 9 wagons to the firm Guardian Motors (Zambia), Ltd., in the care of Mobil Motors, Ltd., Limbe, Malawi, P.O. Box 430; and 2 automobiles to Mobil Motors (Pty), Ltd., P.O. Box 450, Salisbury, Rhodesia.

"The above shipments all were made by the same local firm, Mitchell Cotts and Company. The vehicles shipped were all manufactured by Toyota.

"3. The files of cargo manifest documents do not appear to indicate any goods consigned to the firm, União Comercial de Moçambique (Beira).

"4. Bills of the lading for the respective shipments are filed together with the cargo manifests, indicating that the vehicles have arrived at their destinations."

8. Further to paragraph 5 above, the Committee again included Zambia in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.
9. A third reminder was sent to Zambia on 4 August 1975.

10. On 2 September 1975 the representative of Sweden on the Committee submitted copies of 68 bills of lading concerning the relevant voyage of the vessel Daphne. The documents were analysed and summarized by the expert consultant in three tables. They showed the following number of cars said to have been imported by each of the countries in southern Africa concerned, as compared to the figures reported by Japan and Portugal previously:

<u>Importing country</u>	<u>Reported by Japan</u>	<u>Reported by Portugal</u>	<u>Derived from the Swedish documents</u>
Zambia	151	166	303
Mozambique	6	-	67
Malawi	28	20	28
Southern Rhodesia	-	2	-
	<u>185</u>	<u>188</u>	<u>398</u>
Total			

11. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 7 and 9 of (152) Case No. 168, above.

12. A reply dated 24 October 1975 (also covering Case No. 180) was received from Zambia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Republic of Zambia to the United Nations ... states that an examination of customs documents originating in Malawi and within Zambia reveals that 157 vehicles were shipped on the MV Daphne and one vehicle on the MV Straat Rio, both vessels sailing from Japan on 29 March 1975. The vehicles were disembarked at Beira in transit through Mozambique and Malawi, and all arrived in Zambia.

"The consignee in Zambia was Mobil Motors Zambia, Ltd., P. O. Box 3438, Lusaka, and an examination of the local records reveals that all vehicles duly arrived in Lusaka.

"The vehicles have subsequently been distributed to customers throughout this country and were not re-exported. The Zambian Government is confident that none of these vehicles found its way to Southern Rhodesia."

(154) Case No. 180. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "Straat Rio": United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 27 December 1974 was received from the Netherlands, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 3 of (152) Case No. 168, above.
4. Second reminders were sent to Malawi and Zambia on 28 February 1975.
5. A reply dated 6 March 1975 was received from Malawi, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 4 of (153) Case No. 173.
6. In the absence of a reply from Zambia, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth and seventh quarterly lists which were issued as press releases on 13 March and 10 July 1975, respectively.
7. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of (152) Case No. 168, above.
8. A reply dated 24 October 1975 was received from Zambia, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 11 of (153) Case No. 173, above.

(155) Case No. 182. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "M. Citadel":
United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Second reminders were sent to Portugal and Zambia on 27 January 1975.
4. A reply dated 13 February 1975 was received from Sweden, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As has been communicated earlier, the Swedish Government has transferred the matters to the Chief Public Prosecutor for appropriate legal action. The cases were assigned to the Prosecutor in the district of Malmö.

"The investigation established that the two ships, MS Daphne and MS Citadel, owned by Pearl Shipping, AB, Landskrona, were chartered under a ten-year agreement during the period in question by Wallenius Lines, Stockholm. Wallenius Lines has denied knowledge of any facts that would indicate that the final destination of cargo on any of the ships was Rhodesia. Wallenius Lines had signed a contract of affreightment with two shipping companies in Japan, namely, Nippon Yusen Kaisha and Mitsui OSK Lines, Ltd., concerning shipment of automobiles from Japan to Beira, Mozambique. The Japanese shipping companies had themselves entered into

contracts with the firms that imported the automobiles. Personnel provided by the two Japanese companies loaded the ships in Nasoya and discharged them in Beira. Wallenius Lines has acquired written proof concerning the shipments from the Japanese shipping companies. These documents do not indicate deliveries to Rhodesia. The Prosecutor states further in his report that neither in other respects has the investigation yielded anything that would indicate that deliveries to Rhodesia have been effected. He concludes that no further legal action is called for in the matter.

"Should, however, any further information become available in these cases that might assist the Committee on sanctions in carrying out its functions, the Permanent Representative of Sweden will not fail to communicate it to the Committee."

5. In the absence of replies from Portugal and Zambia, the Committee included those Governments in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
6. A reply dated 8 May was received from Portugal, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 7 of (153) Case No. 173, above.
7. A third reminder was sent to Zambia on 23 June 1975.
8. Further to paragraph 5 above, the Committee again included Zambia in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.
9. On 2 September 1975 the representative of Sweden on the Committee submitted 62 bills of lading concerning the relevant voyage of the vessel Citadel. The documents were analysed and summarized by the expert consultant in three tables. They showed the following number of cars said to have been imported by each of the countries in southern Africa concerned, as compared to the figures reported by Japan:

<u>Importing country</u>	<u>Reported by Japan</u>	<u>Derived from the Swedish documents</u>
Zambia	200	260
Mozambique	42	90
Malawi	23	43
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	<u>265</u>	<u>393</u>

10. Further to paragraph 8 above, the Committee again included Zambia in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

(156) Case No. 195. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "Soula K":
United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 6 January 1975 was received from Japan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"With reference to the information reported by the Government of the United Kingdom that the MV Soula K unloaded a consignment of motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares of Japanese origin at the port of Lourenço Marques, the Government of Japan has established that the aforesaid MV Soula K unloaded no motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares of Japanese origin at the port of Lourenço Marques on the voyage cited, and that the MV Soula K called at the port of Lourenço Marques solely to load a consignment of goods destined for Japan."

4. First reminders were sent to Greece and Panama on 14 February 1975.
5. An acknowledgement dated 19 February 1975 was received from Panama.
6. A reply dated 31 March 1975 was received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"According to information provided by the Greek Government, an investigation under oath concerning the case of the vessel Soula K is being conducted by the Piraeus judicial authorities. The outcome of this investigation will be communicated to the Secretary-General without fail."

7. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.
8. A second reminder was sent to Panama on 16 April 1975.
9. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee included that Government in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.
10. A reply dated 20 June 1975 was received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that on 22 March 1975 the Greek Ministry of Mercantile Marine instructed the Piraeus Port Authority to expedite the completion of the file concerning the case of MV Soula K and to forward it to the competent public prosecutor."

11. A note dated 30 July 1975 was sent to Greece, inquiring whether the investigation had been completed and the result could be communicated to the Committee.

12. A reply dated 21 August 1975 was received from Panama, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"1. Elco Shipping Co., S.A., is indeed a Panamanian company;

"2. The vessel Soula K belongs to the said company but is of Greek registration;

"3. The Panamanian Government believes that it is the Greek Government which should take action if the said vessel has violated the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia imposed by resolution 253 (1968) of the United Nations Security Council;

"4. The Panamanian Government has requested the necessary explanations from Elco Shipping Co., S.A., and has warned that company that it will apply the relevant penalties unless the company complies with the regulations made in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968);

"5. The Mission of Panama will be prepared to transmit to the Secretary-General any further information which it receives on the matter."

13. An acknowledgement dated 5 September 1975 was received from Greece.

(157) Case No. 197. Trade in motor vehicles (and other commodities): United Kingdom note dated 6 December 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 18 February and a second reminder on 21 March 1975.

4. A reply dated 22 April 1975 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to communications of 17 December 1974, 18 February and 21 March 1975, in which the Secretary-General stated that he would be very grateful if the Swiss Government could make an investigation concerning Anacardia, SA, Lugano, and a Mr. Morgash of that company, who is reported to be engaged in large-scale trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The Swiss authorities, wishing to comply with this request as fully as possible, have conducted an investigation which shows the extreme difficulty of obtaining clarifications in this matter. Repeated requests in writing to Anacardia, SA, have thus far remained unanswered. Nor has it been possible to reach by telephone either Mr. Morgash or the sole member of the board of directors of the company. The company does not seem to have a regular staff, and there appear to be strong indications that it may be only domiciled in Switzerland, and be engaged in transactions involving goods of Rhodesian origin consigned directly to third countries.

"However, since the possibility that Rhodesian goods have also been imported into Switzerland by Anacardia via a third country with false certificates of origin cannot be completely ruled out, it would be helpful if the Swiss authorities could be provided with information as to the specific products involved in the alleged illegal transactions, to enable them, if necessary, to take legal action.

"With reference to the export of motor vehicles which Mr. Morgash is reported to be supplying to 'Afro-Trade', various inquiries are being made in an attempt to determine whether this might involve material of Swiss origin, or material originating solely in third countries.

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations would be grateful if the Secretary-General of the United Nations would inform the Security Council Committee ... of the foregoing ..."

5. A further reply dated 25 July 1975 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... in reply to communications PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) Case No. 197 of 17 December 1974, 18 February and 21 March 1975, in which the Secretary-General indicated that he would be grateful if the Swiss Government could carry out an investigation concerning the Anacardia Company of Lugano, has the honour to inform him that the results of the investigation carried out by the competent federal authorities, acting in accordance with the legal means at their disposal, do not confirm the allegations contained in the annex to the Secretary-General's note of 17 December 1974.

"When questioned, Anacardia, SA, categorically denied all the allegations in question and declared that it has never carried out, either on its own behalf or as an intermediary, from Switzerland or through any third country, any commercial or fiduciary transaction whatsoever with Rhodesia. The conjectures entertained in the note of the Permanent Observer to the Secretary-General dated 22 April 1975 are thus not borne out.

"In the absence of more specific and detailed information concerning transactions in which the above-mentioned firm allegedly took part, the

competent federal authorities are not able to pursue their consideration of this matter. Nevertheless, they remain entirely willing to resume their investigation in the event that the sanctions Committee should receive supplementary information in connexion with this case."

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 251st meeting, a note dated 31 October 1975 was sent to Switzerland under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below.

"At its 251st meeting, the Committee considered His Excellency's reply of 25 July 1975 concerning the case referred to above and expressed its appreciation for it.

"The Committee considers this to be a most serious case, as it involves a possible violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, especially through the reported supply of motor vehicles for use by the military or police forces of the illegal régime. It felt, therefore, that in order to facilitate its task of implementing the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council, further investigation into the matter by the Swiss authorities would be helpful. More particularly, the Committee would welcome assurance of a thorough investigation indicating that Anarcadia, S.A., the Swiss company involved, did not conduct any transactions with one Ian Malcolm or with the company called Afro-Trade, both of Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee also noted that, in its reply of 22 April 1975, the Government stated that there were strong indications that Anarcadia, S.A., the Swiss company in question, was engaged in transactions involving goods of Southern Rhodesian origin. The Committee would be interested to know the basis upon which the investigating authorities had subsequently reached conclusive evidence that those indications were unfounded.

"The Committee expressed the hope that it might receive a reply from His Excellency's Government at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

7. At the same meeting, the Committee decided to request the Secretariat to prepare a study of all the cases involving Switzerland.

Aircraft and/or aircraft spares

(158) Case No. 41. Aircraft spares: United Kingdom note dated 5 September 1969

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the third report.

(159) Case No. 67. Supply of aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 January 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(160) Case No. 144. Sale of three Boeing aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. On 13 October 1975, the Committee received information from published sources to the effect that the United States Department of Commerce had issued a bulletin on 4 August 1975, in connexion with this case. The text of the bulletin is reproduced below.

"An indefinite denial of all U.S. export privileges has been issued against Overseas Holidays and Aircraft Hire, (Pty.), Ltd., Braamfontein, Transvaal, South Africa, and the company's Managing Director, Mervyn E. Eyett, the U.S. Department of Commerce announced today.

"Reports on April 17 and 18, 1973, that three Boeing 720 aircraft had been delivered to Salisbury, Rhodesia, in contravention of the United Nations sanctions against that country and in apparent violation of the U.S. Export Administration Regulations, resulted in initiation of an investigation by the Compliance Division, Office of Export Administration. The investigation revealed that Mervyn E. Eyett and Overseas Holidays had taken delivery of three Boeing 720's several days prior to the reported arrival of such aircraft in Salisbury. As a part of the investigation, relevant and material interrogatories and a request for documents were duly served on Eyett and Overseas Holidays concerning the purchase, delivery, use and disposition of the aircraft delivered to them. No response has been received and the period provided for its submission has passed. Good cause for this failure has not been shown.

"Pursuant to Section 388.15 of the Export Administration Regulations, the respondents have been indefinitely denied all U.S. export privileges for failure to respond to the interrogatories and request for documents without good cause having been shown. Restoration of privileges will be considered only after a proper response or a showing of good cause for refusal to respond has been provided.

"All outstanding validated licenses in which Eyett and Overseas Holidays have an interest have been cancelled. The U.S. Export Administration Regulations provide that, without authorization from the U.S. Department of Commerce, no person may trade with a party who has been denied U.S. export privileges, in commodities exported from the United States."

(161) Case No. 162. Viscount aircraft: United Kingdom note dated 17 January 1974

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(162) Case No. 206. Jet fighters and other military equipment: information obtained from published sources

1. At the 233rd meeting on 10 April 1975, the representative of Iraq drew the attention of the Committee to information from published sources, according to which the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia was mounting an undercover operation aimed at building up its air force by acquiring squadrons of jet fighters from certain countries in South America and by recruiting former Royal Air Force men in the United Kingdom to fly them. The information stated that the régime's agents had travelled to South America and had offered to pay Venezuela £6.3 million in cash, on delivery, for 28 United States-made Sabre jets. The agents had also approached international arms dealers in a search for ground attack planes and helicopters.

2. After considering that information, the Committee decided that appropriate draft notes should be prepared for its consideration, under the no-objection procedure, for transmission (a) to Venezuela, drawing the Government's attention to the pertinent information and requesting it to take all possible measures to prevent the occurrence of transactions that would be contrary to the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, and (b) to all Member States, alerting them to the reported attempts by the illegal régime to acquire military equipment abroad and requesting them to reject any such attempts, should they be directed to the Governments at all. The information was also drawn to the attention of the representative of the United Kingdom in the Committee.

3. Accordingly, a note dated 30 April 1975 was sent to all Member States and a note dated 7 May 1975 was sent to Venezuela as indicated above.

4. Acknowledgements were received from the United Kingdom (5 May), Austria and Gabon (6 May) and El Salvador and the Federal Republic of Germany (13 May 1975).

5. A reply dated 14 May 1975 was received from Venezuela, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"After consultations with his Government, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the United Nations has received instructions to categorically deny this report.

"The Permanent Representative of Venezuela accordingly requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to inform all interested parties of the truth of the matter.

"In addition, the Government of Venezuela would be most appreciative if the Security Council Committee ... would inform it of the source which supplied the information in question." f/

6. A reply dated 14 August 1975 was received from Liberia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Chargé d'affaires /of the Permanent Mission of Liberia to the United Nations/, consequent upon instructions from his Government, wishes to inform the Secretary-General that Liberia will, as in the past, take all possible measures to prevent the occurrence of activities such as would be contrary to the application of sanctions against the Southern Rhodesian régime and should be pleased if the Secretary-General would be good enough to inform the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) accordingly."

(163) Case No. 232. Acquisition of DC-8 aircraft by Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1975

1. By a note dated 28 November 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning the acquisition of a DC-8 aircraft by Southern Rhodesia. The text of the note is reproduced below.

The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received reliable information that Southern Rhodesia has recently acquired a DC-8 aircraft.

The information is to the effect that at the end of May 1975 a DC-8 (55F series) aircraft arrived at Salisbury Airport, and was subsequently resprayed to remove identification marks. The aircraft, as indicated by its new registration number (TR-LVK), is operated by Compagnie Gabonaise D'Affretements Aériens (Affretair) of BP484, Libreville, a company believed to be owned by Rhodesian interests, although registered in Gabon.

The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of the Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the attention of the Government of Gabon to the possibility that an airline registered in their country is operating a Rhodesian aircraft.

The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to alert all Member States to the probability that the aircraft in question will be engaged in sanctions breaking and request them to ensure that, in the event of the aircraft entering their territories, it does not deliver cargoes from, or pick up cargoes destined for, Southern Rhodesia.

2. In accordance with the established procedure, the United Kingdom note was circulated to all members of the Committee on 2 December 1975.

f/ A copy of the published source from which the Committee obtained its original information was transmitted to the Permanent Mission of Venezuela to the United Nations on 16 May 1975.

3. On 15 December 1975, the representative of the United States submitted a statement on the matter, the text of which is reproduced below:

"I refer to the United Kingdom note distributed 2 December. Preliminary investigation has revealed that an aircraft, apparently identical to the DC-8 aircraft mentioned in the British note, was sold in the spring of 1975 to a Belgian charter firm named Cargo Air Transport, of Brussels.

"An export licence was issued to cover this transaction. There was no indication or evidence to suggest that there was any knowledge that this aircraft would be subsequently transferred to Affretair or would be used in any way in Rhodesian trade.

"Apparently after delivery to Belgium, the plane was leased or sold to Affretair. The aircraft has also reportedly been registered by the Government of Gabon.

"The Committee may wish to request further details on the illegal transfer of the aircraft from Belgium and Gabon."

4. At the time of preparation of the present report action on the matter was still under consideration by the Committee.

Others

(164) Case No. 88. Cycle accessories: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fifth report.

(165) Case No. 141. Locomotives - "Beira": United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1973

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

K. TEXTILE FABRICS AND RELATED PRODUCTS

(166) Case No. 93. Shirts manufactured in Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

(167) Case No. 150. Cotton corduroy - "Straat Nagasaki": United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. A reply dated 6 January 1975 (also covering Case No. 152) was received from Japan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As the Permanent Representative of Japan stated in his notes dated 17 April 1974 and 18 April 1974, respectively, in reply to the Secretary-General's inquiries, the Government of Japan has constantly kept these matters under review.

"However, no further information regarding the above-mentioned cases, beyond that provided in the notes of the Permanent Representative dated 18 January 1974 and 24 September 1973, respectively, has since come to light.

"In view of the fact that no documentary evidence or any other information has become available to contradict the previous findings of the Government of Japan that the facts do not support allegations that the consignments in question were destined for Southern Rhodesia, the Government of Japan has concluded that there is no basis for maintaining the charge that the consignments in question were destined for Southern Rhodesia unless proof to the contrary is submitted.

"Under these circumstances, the Government of Japan hopes that the Security Council Committee ... is now in a position to bring these cases to a conclusive end, taking fully into account the above facts submitted by the Government of Japan."

4. The representative of Japan on the Committee submitted 10 copies of documents relating to the export of machine-printed cotton fabrics and corduroy. The documents, which were analysed and summarized by the expert consultant, showed that three of them carried no stamp or endorsement, while the others had been endorsed or sealed either by the Ministry of Trade and Industry of Japan or by Japanese Customs authorities, or by Nagao and Co., Ltd., the exporting company, or by banks. Some of them also showed the final destination of the goods to be South Africa, with the port of unloading given as Lourenço Marques.

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 234th meeting, a note dated 19 May 1975 was sent to the Netherlands, requesting any additional information that might come to light from further investigations, as well as copies of the relevant shipping documents that might assist the Committee in its efforts to determine the final destination or consignee of the goods in question.

6. A reply dated 10 June 1975 was received from the Government of the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Netherlands authorities regret not being able to reopen the inquiry into this matter due to the fact that a considerable period of time has elapsed since the inquiry was terminated. The Netherlands Government regrets also not to be able to accede to the request of the sanctions Committee to transmit to the Committee copies of documentation pertaining to the transport of the above-mentioned shipment. It has been previously indicated to the Committee that the Netherlands Government is not in a position to compel private companies to make such information public, since this documentation belongs to the company concerned and forms part of its operations."

7. At the 252nd meeting on 16 October 1975, the representative of Japan informed the Committee, in response to a question put to his delegation previously as to why some of the documents submitted by Japan had not been approved by the Ministry of Trade and Industry, that, according to information received from that Ministry, only export licences required ministerial approval, and that the other documents involved had been exchanged between the exporters and importers.

8. At the 253rd meeting on 30 October 1975, the Committee considered the matter and decided that the case should be closed.

(168) Case No. 152. Textiles - "Ise Maru" and "Acapulco Maru": United Kingdom note dated 7 August 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below:

3. A reply dated 6 January 1975 was received from Japan, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 3 of (167) Case No. 150, above.

4. At the 252nd meeting on 16 October 1975, the representative of Japan informed the Committee that the matter had been kept under review but that no new information had come to light since January 1975.

5. At the 253rd meeting on 30 October 1975, the Committee considered the matter and decided that the case should be closed.

L. SPORTING ACTIVITIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIONS

(169) Case No. 120. Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games: note from the Federal Republic of Germany dated 5 April 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fifth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 233rd meeting on 10 April 1975, the representative of Iraq drew the attention of the Committee to information from published sources according to which the Executive Board of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) was to discuss a report on Southern Rhodesia at their meeting in Lausanne, Switzerland, from 20 to 22 February 1975. The information further stated that the report, which was prepared by a three-man IOC commission that had visited Rhodesia last year, contained general recommendations only and that it would be for the nine members of the Executive Board, under the chairmanship of the IOC President to make recommendations for discussion among the 70 or so members of IOC when they met in plenary session at Lausanne in May.
4. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the same meeting, a note dated 29 April 1975 was sent to all Member States, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below.

"According to information recently received by the Committee, the Executive Board of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) was to discuss a report on Southern Rhodesia at its meeting in Lausanne from 20 to 22 February 1975. The information stated that the report, which was prepared by a three-man IOC commission that had visited Southern Rhodesia last year, contained general recommendations only and that it would be for the nine members of the Executive Board, under the chairmanship of the IOC President, to make recommendations for discussion among the 70 or so members of IOC when they meet in plenary session at Lausanne in May.

"The Committee, whose membership is the same as that of the Security Council, is entrusted by the Council with various duties in connexion with the application of the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee views with serious concern any activities by persons from Southern Rhodesia, particularly those activities purporting to be undertaken at a representational level, which might enhance the status of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or provide the possibility of a breach of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

"The Committee would be grateful if His Excellency's Government could bring this letter to the attention of its National Olympic Committee prior to the May plenary session of IOC at Lausanne, with the Committee's urgent request that the mandatory sanctions of the Security Council be strictly observed, both in letter and in spirit, and that any team purporting to represent Southern Rhodesia not be allowed to participate in the Olympic Games."

5. Acknowledgements were received from El Salvador (5 May), the United Kingdom (5 May), the Federal Republic of Germany (6 May) and Zaire (23 May 1975).

6. On 27 May 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which the International Olympic Committee voted on 22 May 1975 to withdraw its recognition of Southern Rhodesia and to exclude it from the Olympic movement.

7. A reply dated 2 June 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has not failed to bring the contents of the Secretary-General's note of 29 April 1975 to the attention of its national Olympic Committee."

8. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 239th meeting, a press release on the matter, the text of which was adopted at the 240th meeting on 12 June 1975, was issued on the same day. The text of that press release is reproduced below.

"The Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia has been receiving information that Southern Rhodesian individuals and teams are participating or are attempting to participate in international or national sports competitions in many foreign countries. It is also known that foreign competitors participated or attempted to participate in sports events in Southern Rhodesia. The number of attempts by the illegal régime to obtain recognition at the international level through sporting activities and other types of competitions has increased since 1973.

"The Committee has condemned such activities and considered them to be contrary both to the spirit and letter of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), in particular paragraphs 4, 5 and 6. The Committee also considered that such participation in addition to enhancing the image of the illegal régime in the public eye and bringing to it favourable attention, was also a morale booster to the white Rhodesian die-hards.

"It should be noted that the participation in matches and sporting activities abroad by persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia has, in a number of cases, been facilitated by the fact that they held and travelled on foreign passports. In this regard, the Committee addressed notes to Member States of the United Nations requesting their co-operation. As a result of the Committee's intervention, Southern Rhodesia was expelled from several international sports organizations and was barred from participating in some competition championships.

"In order to enhance this trend the Committee welcomes the decision of the International Olympic Committee made in Lausanne, Switzerland, on 22 May 1975 to withdraw its recognition of Rhodesia and exclude it from the

1976 Olympic Games. This decision supports the whole conception and intent of mandatory sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council and upholds fully the long-term activity of the Sanctions Committee in its effort to prevent any participation of Southern Rhodesian residents in international or national sporting events and similar activities, and of foreign individuals or clubs in competitions in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee appreciates the initiative of the International Olympic Committee as an example for all international and regional sports organizations in which Southern Rhodesia holds a membership to take identical measures to terminate the membership of Southern Rhodesia and to stop any relations with competitors and teams of this Territory.

"The Committee has decided to renew its appeal to all Member States of the United Nations to take the necessary steps, through their national sports associations and clubs as well as international sporting federations and associations, to have Southern Rhodesian membership of different international or regional sporting bodies rejected and terminated; and to refuse any new application or membership by any Southern Rhodesian sporting team or association."

(170) Case No. 148. Southern Rhodesia and the Maccabiah Games: information supplied to the Committee by the Sudan on 21 June 1973

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

(171) Case No. 166. Southern Rhodesia and the International Judo Federation (IJF): information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Replies were received from Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Botswana, Chile, Guyana, Qatar and the President of IJF, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 13 December 1974 from Canada

"The Canadian Government has drawn to the attention of appropriate Canadian Judo authorities the concerns expressed in the Secretary-General's note in question. The Permanent Representative wishes at the same time to draw to the attention of the Secretary-General the Canadian Government's policy on sports contacts with Rhodesia: while the Canadian Government discourages Canadian teams or individuals from taking part in sporting events in Rhodesia, it cannot prevent them from travelling there or from

competing as individuals. The Canadian Government does not however support such activities and does not provide financial support or sponsorship to such individuals or their organizations. Neither are they considered in any official way as representative of Canada."

(ii) Note dated 19 December 1974 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"Travellers who present passports or travel documents issued by the Smith régime will be returned by the border control authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany. Since the persons referred to in the above-mentioned notes did not attract notice when they entered the Federal Republic of Germany, it must be assumed that they travelled with documents of some other country.

"Due to the enormous number of travellers into the Federal Republic of Germany, subsequent investigations of the entry documents are possible only if it is known at which border crossing point and at which time the persons in question entered. In hotels aliens are not registered separately.

"The only possibility to find out details of the travel documents is to contact the sports associations which might have taken care of the visitors from Southern Rhodesia. This has been done. As an answer has not yet been received, a reminder was sent to the sport associations. As soon as the outcome of these efforts are available, the Federal Government will submit the requested information to the Secretary-General without delay."

(iii) Note dated 31 December 1974 from Botswana

"With regard to Case No. 166, Botswana has adhered strictly to the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia."

(iv) Note dated 7 January 1975 from Chile

"The Government of Chile, which respects the United Nations resolutions imposing sanctions against the régime in Southern Rhodesia, has requested Chilean sporting associations to refrain from maintaining contact with that club or any other similar institution in that Territory."

(v) Note dated 14 January 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The names of the judokas who participated in the training of private German clubs have been confirmed to have been

Gunter Maeser
Louis Polome
Frans Fyfer
H. Otto

The athletes arrived in the Federal Republic of Germany from Rome and departed for Austria, where they were rejoined by the fifth judoka, who had stayed behind in Rome because of injuries.

"The German Judo Association has not been able to establish the type of passport used by the athletes. However, the fact that other countries likewise granted them unimpeded entry and exit confirms that they cannot have travelled on Southern Rhodesian passports."

(vi) Note dated 29 January 1975 from Guyana

"The Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that action has been taken to alert all judo clubs and associations under the jurisdiction of the Government of Guyana to the danger involved in the attempts of the Salisbury Budokan Judo Club being admitted to membership of the International Judo Federation and the need to take action to prevent it.

"The Guyanese public is reminded frequently of the importance of the relevant United Nations resolution as recommended by the Committee and approved by Security Council resolution 333 (1973)."

(vii) Note dated 5 March 1975 from Qatar

"1. The Government of the State of Qatar has taken stringent enforcement measures to terminate forthwith all economic, commercial, cultural and other relations with the Southern Rhodesia and South African régimes, in accordance with the Amiri Statutes No. 2 of 1967 and No. 140 of 1973.

"2. The Ministry of Economy and Commerce has issued a decree to all local banks, oil companies reinforcing the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

"3. The Ministry of Economy and Commerce, with the co-operation of the Customs Department, examines all purchase contracts of Qatari imported goods in order to prevent any entry of goods produced by the above-mentioned régimes."

Enclosure

"I have the honour of informing that the Amiri Statute No. 2, 1967, has been issued in respect of economic boycott of Southern Rhodesia. Moreover, the Amiri Statute No. 140, 1973, provides for severing all economic, commercial, cultural and other relations with South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia. Immediately upon the issuance of the latter Statute, the Ministry of Economy and Commerce has taken the following measures:

"1. The Ministry forwarded a copy of the Statute No. 140 of 1973 to Qatar Chamber of Commerce and requested the Chamber to circulate it to all commercial firms.

"2. The Ministry's Office of the Boycott of Israel has issued an order to all local banks and oil companies instructing them against accepting any letters of credit or drawings from any party in, and against the shipment of any goods on any means of transportation having the nationalities of the above-mentioned relevant States.

"3. The Office of the Boycott of Israel in the Ministry of Economy and Commerce, in co-operation with the Customs Department, examines all customs documents of goods imported in Qatar and bans the entry of any goods produced by any of the above-mentioned three States.

(viii) Letter dated 8 May 1975 from the President of IJF

"I have at long last had an opportunity of considering your letter of 24 October 1974, together with its enclosures.

"I would like to say at once that my Federation in no way seeks to interfere with the valiant efforts and lofty ideals of your Committee.

"We are, however, bound by our statutes, and, with respect, I do feel that perhaps your enthusiasm for your worthy task may have prevented you from seeing the matter in full perspective.

"It does not follow that because your Committee's view on what we should do is not accepted that this constitutes a failure to 'co-operate' or thereby in any manner any kind of acceptance of a racially based system.

"It is not for us to endorse or otherwise the work of your Committee and, with respect, I do not think that the requirements of the resolution necessitate us amending our statutes in any way; indeed I think it would be very dangerous territory if we were to be used as a political weapon, and whether or not this was the intention such would seem to be the inevitable conclusion to be drawn were we to act in the manner which you suggest. As I read it, the resolution expressly excludes educational purposes in certain areas and I would like to stress that so far as my Federation is concerned our view is not only that we are acting in accordance with our statutes and in the best interests of judo as a sport, but indeed sport at large and also in a manner which is not inconsistent with your Committee's work.

"The enclosed extract from an interview which I gave to a representative of the press from the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic may be of assistance to you in amplifying my personal attitude.

"I do not think, however, that there is anything I can usefully add on behalf of my Federation."

Enclosure

"QUESTION 5 - And now a question very close to your heart. Do you think the discrimination or racism, in view of the present clear status, is a political disturbing of sport?

ANSWER:

"This is a question on which I could talk for hours, but I shall not do so or you will be unable to find space to publish my reply.

"In the first place, the statutes of my Federation state quite clearly that the IJF is non-political and does not recognize differences of race or religion, and with them I agree. I also feel that all these three things are equally important. I would always fight against any form of discrimination within my sport of a political, racial or religious nature.

"I think it is important to realize that I concern myself only with the administration of my sport. I am not a politician. I am not religious. I am not a racist.

"There are such people in the world, and I do not particularly agree with any of them. Remember, there are whole nations based on political, religious or racial beliefs, and what these nations do may displease, offend or even disgust me, but I do not allow that to interfere with my thinking or activities on behalf of International Judo.

"My only task is to see that these things do not interfere in my sport. I leave the politicians, the religious leaders and the pro- or anti-racists to solve their own problems. The IJF has avoided any political problems by refusing to permit any political arguments or reasons to interfere in any way or to effect any of its decisions. The IJF has equally avoided any religious problems by refusing to accept any requests for special treatment in the selection of who should fight who in the early rounds of any competitions and has based its decisions on the democratic, free compliance with our statutes.

"The only racist problems the IJF has encountered is with South Africa and Rhodesia. The case of South Africa can be quickly resolved, since judo in South Africa is not practiced and played on a multiracial basis yet. Although members of all ethnic groups play the sport, they have different Federations and train generally apart. They, therefore, would not qualify for membership of the IJF.

"The other case concerns Rhodesia and the IJF Directing Committee was given evidence from black and white Rhodesians that judo was practiced non-racially in Rhodesia and therefore, although members of the Directing Committee and IJF may or may not agree with the politics and policies of that country, the IJF does not or would not concern itself with these policies any more than it would concern itself with whether a country was socialist, royalist or capitalist, etc.

"Rhodesia could therefore have been a possible candidate for membership. However, neither South Africa or Rhodesia has been refused membership of the IJF, because neither of them has yet applied and the reason is because members of the IJF are acquired through membership of one of the five Continental Unions, and although these countries have applied to their Continental Union for membership, they have never been considered or refused, since it is a requirement of the African Union, to which they would naturally belong, that candidate countries should personally attend a Congress of the Union. The delegations of these two countries have never been able to attend an African Union Congress, and therefore the question was in suspense within the IJF for several years.

"However, I can safely say that with the current set-up within South Africa, if South Africa had applied it would not have been accepted. Not because South Africa runs its country on a racial basis but because, I repeat, the way the country is run does not concern the IJF, but because it runs its judo on such a basis.

"The case of Rhodesia has also been resolved, since at its most recent meeting, held in Rio de Janeiro in September 1974, the IJF Directing Committee recognized that for one reason or another, very few member Federations of the IJF had any relations with Rhodesia and that even if investigations should prove that Judo was practiced on a perfectly non-racial basis, it would still be impossible for the vast majority of IJF member Federations to invite them to attend championships or for them to go there for championships.

"The Directing Committee therefore decided for these reasons that it would not be in the best interests of all the other member Federations to proceed any further with investigations. Since that time, the IOC Commission on Rhodesia has published its findings, in which judo is briefly mentioned and which information given to that Commission is at least the same as the information given to the IJF and we shall await the findings of the ICC on that report with interest.

"So if I may sum up my feelings. Although there are many things in the world with which I disagree, I feel it would be quite wrong of me to try to use sport to change them, in exactly the same way in which I will always resist to the utmost any endeavour on the part of any such things to change our sport."

(172) Case No. 167. Tour of Southern Rhodesian cricket player abroad:
information obtained from published sources

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(173) Case No. 174. Hockey team tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Two replies were received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 17 December 1974

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany had talks again with the sports associations on this subject. The Federal Government was informed that sport clubs only undertake tours to South Africa and Southern Rhodesia if the costs of travel, board and lodging are met by the host clubs. Normally, no funds are transferred from the Federal Republic of Germany to Southern Rhodesia; nor are any bookings made with travel agents in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Federal Government would appreciate it if the conclusions of the IOC study on sport conditions in Southern Rhodesia could be made available to it for its talks with the sports associations regarding a complete stop of representative sports contacts with Southern Rhodesia." g/

(ii) Note dated 7 January 1975

"At its 106th meeting on 11-12 October 1974, the Executive Committee of the German Sports Associations unanimously decided to maintain its policy as laid down in the recommendations of 1970 and 1973 and to request the member organizations to continue to practice restraint in their relations with the Republic of South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia, especially in cases where the composition of the teams from these countries is not racially mixed. Sports meets of a representative nature are not to be arranged."

(174) Case No. 175. Yachting coach on tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

g/ See paras. 3 and 4 of (169) Case No. 120, above, and paras. 5, 6 and 9 of (178) Case No. 192, below.

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 246th meeting, a note dated 12 September 1975 was sent to Belgium, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below:

"The Committee has received information from published sources to the effect that a Spanish national yachting instructor named Paul Maes undertook a visit, at the end of April 1974, to Rhodesia in order to coach Southern Rhodesian teams.

"The Committee requested the Secretary-General to inform the Spanish Government of the matter and to request it to make an inquiry concerning this information.

"In its reply the Spanish Government indicated that Mr. Paul Maes, who works periodically as an instructor with the Spanish Yachting Federation, is domiciled in Belgium and is of Belgian nationality.

"Last spring, during his vacation, Mr. Maes reportedly travelled to Belgium and from there, at the invitation of the Rhodesia Yachting Association, to Southern Rhodesia in a purely private capacity.

"The Committee believes that the Belgian Government, in its efforts to ensure respect for the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council against the illegal Southern Rhodesia régime, would be interested in being brought up-to-date on this information."

4. An acknowledgement dated 17 September 1975 was received from Belgium.

(175) Case No. 181. Southern Rhodesia and the Federation of International Football Associations (FIFA): information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.

3. A reply dated 19 December 1974 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive portion of which reads as follows:

"Travellers who present passports or travel documents issued by the Smith régime will be returned by the border control authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany. Since the persons referred to in the /Secretary-General's/ notes did not attract notice when they entered the Federal Republic of Germany, it must be assumed that they travelled with documents of some other country.

"Due to the enormous number of travellers into the Federal Republic of Germany, subsequent investigations of the entry documents are possible

only if it is known at which border crossing point and at which time the persons in question entered. In hotels aliens are not registered separately.

"The only possibility to find out details of the travel documents is to contact the sports associations which might have taken care of the visitors from Southern Rhodesia. This has been done. As an answer has not yet been received, a reminder was sent to the sport associations. As soon as the outcome of these efforts are available, the Federal Government will submit the requested information to the Secretary-General without delay."

4. At the 229th meeting on 13 March 1975, the representative of Iraq drew the attention of the Committee to information from published sources, according to which the President of the so-called National Football Association of Rhodesia (NFAR), Mr. John Madzima, after having held talks, in the course of a month-long visit abroad, with FIFA President, Dr. Joao Havelange, in Brazil and having met other officials in Europe, took back the news that a delegation from FIFA would soon visit Southern Rhodesia for an on-the-spot investigation of the game in the country. Subsequent to Mr. Madzima's meeting with the FIFA President in Brazil, a Rio de Janeiro newspaper, Journal do Brazil, was said to have carried a report in which Dr. Havelange was quoted as saying that NFAR would be able to participate in FIFA, if they could show that racial discrimination was no longer present in their sporting teams. According to the same report, Dr. Havelange assured Mr. Madzima that FIFA would send a commission of inquiry to Southern Rhodesia, probably within the next two months, and that if the commission were to decide that there was no discrimination in soccer in Southern Rhodesia, Dr. Havelange would consider raising the question of admittance of the so-called NFAR to FIFA at that organization's next meeting. Mr. Madzima was reported to be optimistic that the Commission would be satisfied that there was no racial discrimination in soccer in Southern Rhodesia and that the delegation's findings would pave the way for Southern Rhodesia's re-entry into international football. Apart from his many meetings with Dr. Havelange and other top FIFA officials, Mr. Madzima was also reported to have visited several African States, where the aspirations of the so-called NFAR had been given "encouraging and sympathetic" hearing. He is reported to have said that two top African referees with international recognition from FIFA would be visiting Southern Rhodesia soon.

5. After considering that information, the Committee decided that appropriate draft notes should be prepared for its approval, under the "no-objection" procedure, for transmission: (a) to all Member States, apprising them of the matter and requesting them to draw the attention of the sports organization in their countries to the situation; and (b) to Brazil, requesting information on how Mr. John Madzima, president of the so-called NFAR, had been allowed to enter Brazil. Similarly, the Committee decided that appropriate draft letters should be prepared for its approval, under the "no-objection" procedure, for transmission to FIFA and to the Organization of African Unity (OAU), bringing to their attention the information received by the Committee and, in the former instance, again urging FIFA to comply with the United Nations sanctions, and, in the latter instance, among other things, requesting information in connexion with the so-called NFAR President's visit to African States and the reported visit to Southern Rhodesia by two internationally recognized African referees.

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the same meeting notes were sent to Brazil on 26 March and to all Member States on 1 April, and letters were sent to the Administrative Secretary-General of OAU and to the President of FIFA, on 26 March 1975, stating as indicated above.

7. Acknowledgements dated 7 and 8 April 1975 were received from El Salvador, the Federal Republic of Germany and Gabon.

8. Replies were received from the Secretary-General of FIFA, Kenya and Ethiopia, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Letter dated 18 April 1975 from the Secretary-General of FIFA

"FIFA received the letter dated 26 March addressed to FIFA president, Dr. Havelange, in connexion with the FIFA membership of the national football body of Rhodesia.

"May we first of all refer to a similar letter you sent FIFA on 9 September 1974 h/ and to which we replied with our letter of 19 September 1974 i/ giving you full information as to the position of the football organization of Rhodesia within FIFA. The basic problem as such has not changed whereas the organization of the football activities within Rhodesia was subject to some alterations. May we add that Rhodesia, under the name of Football Association of Rhodesia, is a member of FIFA since 1965.

"As to the present internal situation in Rhodesia, may I be permitted to refer to the enclosed photocopy of a letter I sent to Dr. Havelange on the 27 February (enclosure green copy in French original and English translation). As far as your questions are concerned, I would like to answer as follows:

"(a) Several members of our Executive Committee including Dr. Havelange have had an opportunity to meet Mr. Madzima, who is the chairman of the national organization, as mentioned in para. 4 of my letter to Dr. Havelange;

"(b) A commission has not yet been set up. This would be a matter for our Executive Committee;

"(c) The press reports are certainly wrong, as Congress alone would be entitled to grant membership to a new organization. See my letter to Dr. Havelange.

h/ See S/11594/Rev.1, annex II, (169) Case No. 181, para. 4 (iii).

i/ There was no record of the letter referred to having been received. However, efforts were made to obtain a copy of that letter from FIFA, which was subsequently received and is reproduced in para. 10 of this case.

"(d) The visit to Rhodesia of two top African referees has nothing to do with the FIFA suspension nor with the FIFA Technical Committee. As individuals and if the visa difficulties can be overcome, they may go to Rhodesia.

"Also concerning the lifting of the suspension, may I add that only the FIFA Congress is competent and would, of course, take its decisions after having thoroughly examined the situation."

Text of letter to Dr. Havelange

"Your letter of 18 February, together with the photocopied report of the IOC regarding Rhodesia, has just reached me, and I thank you.

"Your letter crossed with mine - I mean the circular which I sent to all members of the Executive Committee enclosing a photocopy of the report received from the IOC secretariat, with the idea that all Executive Committee members should read this report, in order that, if need be, a fruitful exchange of ideas could take place at a future meeting of the Committee. This is the reason for circulating this documentation.

"Perhaps you will remember that, as far as football is concerned, the Africans have never said that there was discrimination, but on the contrary justified their request for suspension stating that, in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations, no holder of a Rhodesian passport could enter countries affiliated to UNO, and that whilst and for as long as this situation lasted, Rhodesia would not be able to take part in competitions organized at FIFA or continental Confederation level.

"In the field of football, to all this must be added the fact that far-reaching internal changes have taken place in Rhodesian football, i.e., that the National Association affiliated to FIFA at the moment no longer controls more than 5 per cent at the most of Rhodesian football, whilst the new organization, of which Mr. Madzima is the President, has in its ranks at least 95 per cent!

"More than a year ago, we tried to make both sides understand that an agreement between them was essential for the affiliation to FIFA to be maintained - although as a 'suspended Association'. We explained to the former secretary of the FIFA member Association and to Mr. Madzima, President of the new organization, that if the former Association had to be expelled from FIFA, the new one would have to make an official request for affiliation; and that as long as there was no change in the political situation, it would probably have no chance of being admitted as a member; but that on the other hand, if the new and the former organizations could agree for the new association to take over directly all the rights of the National Association affiliated to FIFA, with the agreement of the latter, legally there would be no resignation or new affiliation, but simply a change of name.

"Up to the present, it seems that neither one nor the other has understood or wants to understand the basic problem.

"Moreover, I have made a very careful examination of the file given to you by Mr. Madzima which you kindly passed on to me, and I would like to bring up the following points:

- "1. The minutes of 18 November 1973 falls within a period before the latest conversations we have had with Mr. Madzima and his friends. On the other hand, the President's report, which is attached to it, is dated December 1974. Unfortunately, in his report, he has not passed on to his members what we suggested should be done to achieve an automatic affiliation to FIFA - why, I do not know - in view of the fact that a take-over de jure et de facto of the old organization by the new one seemed easy to achieve given that Mr. Kerr, former secretary of the Association affiliated to FIFA had resigned and returned to his own country, Scotland.
- "2. A very interesting document is President Madzima's memorandum dated 11 January 1975. For the first time, it is quite clear that the Land Tenure Act divides the land of the country into three categories:
 - I. Ground for exclusive use of Europeans (he probably means whites);
 - II. Ground for exclusive use of the Africans;
 - III. National ground reserved for national parks etc.

"In addition, this law seems to contribute greatly to a division of those taking part in sport according to race. In reality, according to this report, the Europeans enjoy many privileges which the Africans do not. Thus, the sports grounds which have once been handed over to the clubs composed of Europeans are assigned to them for 99 or 60 years, without any municipal interference, and those who hold these grounds do not let them to African clubs; on the other hand, in the zones reserved for Africans, the clubs are not able to obtain possession of grounds on similar conditions to those available to Europeans, and Mr. Madzima draws the conclusion that African clubs do not have the same facilities for formation. He concludes that 'European' sports clubs were easily able to obtain their sports grounds and, even if they are not very active at the moment, they can keep them. New clubs within the European community easily obtain grounds made available by the municipalities, towns and villages, which is not the case in the sector reserved for Africans. Indirectly, a racial situation results, concludes Mr. Madzima.

"In a further paragraph, he states that only Europeans can become members of

European clubs and that, even here, the clubs are often formed on an ethnic basis (Wingate Club = mainly Jews; Callies Club = mainly Scots; Hellenic Club = mainly Greeks; Portuguese Club = mainly Portuguese etc.), but, despite this, other Europeans can easily gain admittance, whereas non-Europeans may not become members of these clubs at all.

"In his memorandum, Mr. Madzima, underlines that in Rhodesia all sports are controlled by National Associations to which the provincial organizations are affiliated, and the provincial organizations are formed by the clubs. And he adds that with the possible exception of football and athletics, no sport is allowed to affiliate members on an integrated basis - with very rare exceptions.

"According to him, multiracial sport consists of competitions between teams made up of players of the same race against teams possibly made up of players of another race; in any case, it is rare for there to be people of different races in the same team. (Remark from the General Secretary: in any case, the national team of Rhodesia was a completely mixed team and at one time the President was black with a Greek name.)

"Sport in schools follows the same system of the schools, which are completely separate for the different races. Whereas students of European origin, says Mr. Madzima, have the opportunity to practice any sport, African pupils are restricted to football and some other sports. Another difficulty seems to be the lack of funds and coaches. Football seems to be the most popular sport and he says that progress in football is mainly due to the fact that it is the only sport in the country which has a completely non-racial character. Its constitution is non-racial and its officials are elected on a non-racial basis. The clubs admit members from any ethnic origin and one can really say that football is an integrated sport, which is not the case for other sports. Then he speaks of the other different sports, which is very interesting but does not concern us as footballers.

"The report, I repeat, is very interesting, particularly if it is read in relation to the report drawn up by the IOC Commission of Enquiry.

"I will write to Mr. Madzima again to try to convince him of the need to reach an agreement with the former officials of the almost defunct National Association affiliated to FIFA, in order to avoid the formalities of the expulsion of the organization which does not effectively control football any longer in Rhodesia and the improbable admission to FIFA of a new organization however African or mixed it may be.

"I would like to add that on page 22, under point 7, the Olympic report refers to the Land Tenure Act but without drawing the conclusions made by Mr. Madzima in his memorandum (facilities for Europeans to have sports grounds near-impossibility for the Africans to obtain grounds in the areas which are none the less reserved for them).

"Personally, I think that for as long as the political situation in Rhodesia remains unsolved, we will have difficulties as far as sport is concerned, less from the racial discrimination point of view, but rather for practical reasons (impossibility for Rhodesian passport-holders to travel to countries affiliated to the United Nations. These are the essential points I wish to bring up."

(ii) Note dated 29 April 1975 from Kenya

"The Permanent Representative of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations ... with reference to the note regarding Case No. 181, brought to the attention of the Permanent Mission at the request of the Security Council Committee ..., has the honour to inform that its contents have been brought to the attention of the Government of the Republic of Kenya.

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kenya has in turn informed the Ministry of Housing and Social Services, specifically requesting it to see to it that the so-called 'National Football Association of Rhodesia' does not gain admission to FIFA. The relevant sporting authorities in Kenya will therefore be fully appraised of the situation, with a view to asking them to block any moves that may be made by the Football Association of the illegal Southern Rhodesia régime to obtain admission to FIFA."

(iii) Note dated 28 May 1974 from Ethiopia

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the contents of his note has been transmitted to the National Ethiopian Sports Confederation and would also like to assure him that every step will be taken to insure the effective implementation of Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Furthermore, in order to apprise the Secretary-General of the actions previously taken by the Ethiopian Football Federation on the matter, some pertinent documents are enclosed herewith." j/

9. A first reminder was sent to Brazil on 28 May 1975.

10. The text of the letter referred to in foot-note i/ above, originally addressed to the Chairman of the Committee by the Secretary-General of FIFA, reads as follows:

j/ The documentation submitted by Ethiopia consisted of photocopies of the minutes of FIFA Congress in Mexico City, 1970, showing the various proposals on the matter put forward or supported by Ethiopia, as well as of a letter dated 26 November 1969 from the Secretary-General of the Ethiopia Football Federation addressed to the Secretary-General of FIFA, putting Ethiopia's case for the expulsion of the Rhodesian Federation from FIFA.

"We acknowledge receipt of your letter of 9 September concerning the Football Association of Rhodesia.

"We feel that it is necessary to give you the full information: Rhodesia became a member of FIFA in 1965 under the name of the Football Association of Rhodesia. According to the provisions of article 1, para. 3 of the FIFA statutes, FIFA as such is not concerned with political changes leading up to the United Nations resolution 253 (1968), but at the 1970 Congress in Mexico, a majority of Congress delegates accepted an African proposal to suspend the Football Association of Rhodesia 'for the time being', as due to the aforesaid resolution and the instructions issued, no Rhodesian passport holder was permitted to enter countries bound by the resolution of the United Nations.

"Rhodesia is still suspended and the Football Association of Rhodesia has in the meantime lost its authority as the controlling body of football because a breakaway organization incorporates approximately 95% of the football clubs and footballers in that country.

"The internal organization of sport is a matter for the clubs and leagues in Rhodesia as it is FIFA's policy not to interfere in the domestic problems of the affiliated national associations.

"The suspension means that Rhodesian football clubs cannot play against teams belonging to other national associations in membership with FIFA, either at home or abroad.

"Sport and sporting organizations should be immune from politics and it is in fact a pity that all over the world political influence on sport is increasing.

"If you have further questions on this subject, please do not hesitate to let us know.

11. A letter dated 6 June 1975 was also received from the Permanent Representative of Brazil, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"With reference to your note of 26 March 1975, I have the honour to inform you that the Brazilian Government is investigating the reported meeting in Brazil between Mr. John Madzima, president of the National Football Association of Rhodesia, and Mr. Joao Havelange, president of FIFA.

"Mr. Havelange, however, being president of the above-mentioned international football association, is the sole person responsible for his actions in that capacity. Consequently, the Brazilian Government cannot accept responsibility for the actions undertaken by Mr. Havelange in his capacity as president of FIFA."

12. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 246th meeting, a note dated 7 October 1975 was sent to all Member States, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below.

"The Committee would like to refer to the note dated 1 April 1975 which, at its request, the Secretary-General addressed to the Permanent Representative on the question of attempts by a sporting association in Southern Rhodesia to obtain international recognition.

"In that note, the attention of His Excellency's Government was drawn in particular to the reported efforts of the so-called National Football Association of Rhodesia (NFAR) to be admitted to the Fédération internationale de football association (FIFA).

"The Committee has also been informed that another organization called the Football Association of Rhodesia (FAR), which in 1970 was suspended 'for the time being' from FIFA, is trying to obtain its re-admission.

"The Committee would be grateful if His Excellency's Government could bring this matter to the attention of football clubs and associations under its jurisdiction so that no football association in Southern Rhodesia could receive any type of recognition; and furthermore that the so-called Football Association of Rhodesia (FAR) be expelled from the International Federation (FIFA)."

13. Acknowledgements were received from Canada (9 October), the Federal Republic of Germany (14 October), Austria (4 November) and Zaire (17 November 1975).

14. Replies were also received from Guinea and India, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 9 October 1975 from Guinea

"With reference to your note of 7 October 1975 (Case No. 181), I have the honour to inform you that the Government of the Republic of Guinea has no relations with the minority racist régime of Rhodesia; moreover, it takes both political and diplomatic action against that régime. Accordingly, no sports, cultural or other association has any relations with Rhodesian or South African associations.

"The Government of the Republic of Guinea will certainly strongly condemn the participation of the National Football Association of Rhodesia (NFAR) and the Football Association of Rhodesia (FAR) in the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA).

"The National Youth Committee of Guinea, to which, as the appropriate national body responsible for sports matters, we are referring the note, will not fail to bring this violation of United Nations resolutions to the attention of the international sports authorities and to take action, together with the African associations, against the Federation."

(ii) Note dated 2 December 1975 from India

"The Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations ... has the honour to state that India maintains a complete boycott of the racist illegal minority régime of Southern Rhodesia and that this extends to participation in sports events also. Consistent with this policy, the Government of India has informed the All India Football Federation of the contents of the Secretary-General's note referred to above so that appropriate action is taken."

(176) Case No. 186. Southern Rhodesia and the International Chess Federation (FIDE): information obtained from published sources

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(177) Case No. 191. New Zealand cricket club tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 24 January 1975 (also covering Case No. 192) was received from the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 31 December 1974 in which you were kind enough to inform me that a hockey team from the Federal Republic of Germany and a cricket team from New Zealand had travelled last September to Southern Rhodesia to participate in competitive sports events with Southern Rhodesian teams.

"I most sincerely thank you for this important communication, which is further evidence of the spirit of co-operation prevailing between your Committee and our Organization.

"The secretariat of OAU holds that all sports or other activities with Southern Rhodesia inevitably represent support for it and undoubtedly constitute a flagrant violation of United Nations and OAU resolutions on the question of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. For that reason, it completely agrees with and strongly supports the Security Council Committee's position on the question of Southern Rhodesia, which is in accordance with OAU's views on this matter."

4. A first reminder was sent to New Zealand on 28 February 1975.

5. A reply dated 26 March 1975 was received from New Zealand, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Chargé d'affaires has the honour to advise the Secretary-General that the inquiries into the circumstances of the visit which were undertaken by the New Zealand authorities did not reveal any breach of the United Nations sanctions resolution 253 (1968) on Southern Rhodesia or of the Exchange Control Regulations 1965, the two sets of New Zealand legislation which implement sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The inquiries were centred on the method employed to transfer funds to Southern Rhodesia to finance the tour and on whether the transfer of funds and their use offended under the Sanctions Regulations or the Exchange Control Regulations. The New Zealand Government is satisfied that, in this case, there is no evidence capable of sustaining a prosecution for any alleged breach of these Regulations."

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 247th meeting, a note dated 13 October 1975 was sent to New Zealand, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below:

"The Committee considered the reply dated 26 March 1975 from the Permanent Mission of New Zealand concerning a tour to Southern Rhodesia by a cricket club of New Zealand. The Committee was grateful for the information it contained, in particular that no evidence had been found that the method employed to transfer funds to Southern Rhodesia to finance the tour had offended under the New Zealand legislation on sanctions.

"The Committee, however, expressed its concern that to limit the mandate of the investigating authorities in such a way might have entailed a corresponding limitation in their possibility to discover some sort of violation of the sanctions. In that connexion, the Committee would like to reiterate its views expressed in the Secretary-General's note of 5 November 1974, that participation by foreigners in sports events in Southern Rhodesia enhances the position of the illegal régime and is contrary to the spirit and intent of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee, therefore, wonders whether additional information could be provided to it; in particular concerning the banking facilities used by the New Zealand team during that trip, the carriers which transported it to and from Southern Rhodesia and the itinerary followed. The Committee also would like to know whether the Government of New Zealand expressed its disapproval for such a trip to the persons concerned.

"The Committee would appreciate receiving the information indicated above and any further comments which could assist it in its work at the earliest convenience of His Excellency's Government and if possible within a month."

7. A reply dated 12 December 1975 was received from New Zealand, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of New Zealand to the United Nations has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 13 October requesting additional information on the circumstances surrounding the visit to Southern Rhodesia by the Tui Cricket Club.

"So far as the team's banking facilities are concerned, the New Zealand authorities have noted that the direct remittance of funds from New Zealand to Southern Rhodesia is blocked by the Reserve Bank of New Zealand under the Exchange Control Regulations, 1956; that the United Nations Sanctions (Southern Rhodesia) Regulations, 1968 prohibit the remittance of funds to any place within Southern Rhodesia by a New Zealand citizen outside New Zealand; and that the latter regulations also stipulate that a New Zealand citizen may not cause funds to be transferred to Southern Rhodesia either directly or indirectly. Current exchange control policy permits trading banks to allocate up to NZ\$1,000 in foreign currency to travellers planning to be away from New Zealand for up to one month. It has been ascertained that members of the Tui Cricket Club employed the usual banking channels in applying for funds to travel overseas. Since all funds so issued are freely convertible and can be used anywhere in the world, however, the Reserve Bank of New Zealand is not able to exercise control over the funds once they have been issued.

"As regards the team's travel arrangements, the New Zealand authorities have established that arrangements were made in New Zealand only for the team's travel as far as South Africa. The following carriers were used:

<u>Journey</u>	<u>Carrier</u>	<u>Date</u>
Auckland to Sydney	Air New Zealand	23.8.74
Sydney to Johannesburg	South African Airways	24.8.74
Johannesburg to Blantyre	" " "	26.8.74
Blantyre to Salisbury	" " "	Open
Salisbury to Johannesburg	" " "	Open
Johannesburg to Perth	" " "	20.9.74
Sydney to Auckland	QANTAS	26.9.74

"The New Zealand authorities do not have details of the team's itinerary in Southern Rhodesia. It has been informed however that three matches were played in Malawi, four in Southern Rhodesia, one in South Africa and one in Australia.

"The New Zealand Government's position on the tour was set out fully in a press statement issued by the then Associate Minister of Foreign Affairs on 16 September 1974. Two copies of that press statement are attached.

Enclosure

Text of the press statement by the Hon. A. J. Walding,
the Associate Minister of Foreign Affairs

"The Associate Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon. J. A. Walding, said today that Ministers and Members of Parliament had received many telegrams and letters protesting about the Tui Cricket Club's tour to South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The question was constantly asked whether any breach of the United Nations (Southern Rhodesia) Regulations 1968 which imposed economic sanctions on Southern Rhodesia had been made. These Regulations were passed in New Zealand by the previous Government after the United Nations Security Council adopted resolutions, in particular No. 253 of 1968, to prevent trade with the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and called on nations to prevent the transmission of funds there.

"These regulations are still in force,' said Mr. Walding, 'and this Government like the last continues to observe strictly the economic sanctions on Southern Rhodesia and has blocked all trade between the two countries, as all member states of the United Nations are obliged to do by the mandatory decision of the Security Council. No links of any kind exist between the illegal Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia (or Zimbabwe as it is sometimes known) and the New Zealand Government. Southern Rhodesian passports are not recognised and travel agents in New Zealand in particular have been advised from time to time that these Regulations and the Exchange Control Regulations 1965 together make it an offence either to remit funds from New Zealand to Southern Rhodesia or to cause funds to be transferred directly or indirectly there. New Zealand citizens are also prohibited, no matter where they are, from entering into or being concerned with dealings in any goods knowing that they are to be imported into Southern Rhodesia. Since the illegal Smith régime declared its independence in 1965, there have been a number of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions of one kind or another on Southern Rhodesia', said Mr. Walding, 'but there has been no specific reference to sporting exchanges.'

"Mr. Walding stated that there is no New Zealand law which prevents New Zealanders, either individually or in groups, from going to Southern Rhodesia or to South Africa. New Zealanders are free to travel wherever and whenever they wish and no Government would seek to deprive citizens of this country from exercising this right. What the law does is render illegal certain economic, trading and financial activities by New Zealanders in respect of Southern Rhodesia.

"Mr. Walding said the Government's position with regard to sporting contacts with South Africa and its non-recognition of the illegal Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia were well known to all by now. The Tui Cricket Club and its organizers can hardly claim ignorance of the Government's attitude to racist sport nor of the restrictions on dealings with Southern

Rhodesia. And certainly they must have been aware of the opposition of many New Zealanders to attempts of this kind to bolster apartheid policies of the South African Government or give support to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

"Mr. Walding said that the information at the Government's disposal was principally based on press reports and that there was insufficient evidence at the moment that any breach of any of the regulations in respect of Southern Rhodesia had in fact taken place. The Government proposed to seek clarification of the situation from those responsible for organising the tour and would take whatever action seemed appropriate in light of the outcome of its inquiry."

(178) Case No. 192. Hockey club tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 24 January 1975 was received from the Secretary-General of OAU, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 3 of (177) Case No. 191, above.
4. A reply dated 3 March 1975 was also received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany had thorough talks with the competent sports associations on this subject. The Federal Government was informed that, at the time, a number of senior players of the hockey club Frankfurt 1880, together with players of other clubs, some of them accompanied by their wives, were touring several African countries, including Southern Rhodesia. However, no player of the European men's hockey club champions had joined the Frankfurt tour party. As in other cases, the voyage was neither carried out by nor booked with a German airline. No funds have been transferred from the Federal Republic of Germany to Southern Rhodesia, as the players and their wives were guests of the host clubs.

"Under these circumstances, it seems that the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia imposed by the Security Council have not been violated.

"In this connexion, the Federal Government would like to refer to its former notes in similar cases and its request to obtain the conclusions of the IOC (International Olympic Committee) study on sports conditions in Southern Rhodesia. k/ This study would be most useful for the Federal Government's talks with the sports associations regarding a complete stop of sports contacts of a representative nature with Southern Rhodesia."

5. A letter dated 15 September 1975 was sent to the Secretary-General of the International Olympic Committee requesting a copy of the report on sports conditions in Southern Rhodesia.
6. By a letter dated 2 October 1975 the Director of IOC transmitted copies of the report of IOC Commission of Inquiry for Southern Rhodesia.
7. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 247th meeting, a note dated 13 October 1975 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, requesting further details on the tour of Southern Rhodesia by the Frankfurt 1880 hockey club, particularly with regard to the means of transport used by the team, the itinerary which was followed and the banking arrangements provided to the participants.

k/ See para. 3 (i) of (173) Case No. 174, above.

8. An acknowledgement dated 22 October 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

9. On 14 November 1975, a copy of the IOC report on sports in Southern Rhodesia was sent to the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations.

(179) Case No. 198. Southern Rhodesia and golf championships in Colombia: information obtained from published sources

1. In November 1974, the Committee received information from published sources according to which the Rhodesia Golf Union had accepted an invitation from the Colombian Golf Federation to send a team to the 1975 World Pairs Championships, Bogota, Colombia. The information further indicated that the Southern Rhodesian team of two players and a manager would have their air fares and accommodations paid by the Colombian Golf Federation as a bonus for the team's performance previously in the Eisenhower Trophy. 1/

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 219th meeting, a note dated 24 January 1975 was sent to Colombia, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the possibility of participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such an event was of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia was in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions.

3. A first reminder was sent to Colombia on 17 March, a second reminder on 25 April 1975 and a third reminder on 1 July 1975.

4. A reply dated 8 July 1975 was received from Colombia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations ... has the honour to reproduce below the communication sent on 2 May 1975 by the President of the Colombian Golf Federation to Mr. J. Horn, Secretary of the Rhodesian Golf Union (P.O. Box 3327, Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia).

"This letter will refer to our previous correspondence concerning our formal invitation to the III International Team Championship in August this year. Subsequent to our invitation and your very kind acceptance we received several communications concerning your country's representation at our forthcoming tournament.

1/ See (180) Case No. 199, below.

"These communications led to several visits with the Ministry of Foreign Relations, and it is with considerable regret on our part that the Colombian Golf Federation must now withdraw its invitation.

"There really are no words to express our personal feelings in this matter but we must follow the guidelines set for us in this matter by our Government.

"Please accept our sincerest apologies for any inconveniences caused you in this matter and we look forward to the time when we shall again be competing with your team in our tournament."

5. In July 1975, the Committee received information from published sources according to which the Colombian Golf Federation had renewed its invitation to the Southern Rhodesian team. The same sources further announced in August 1975 that the Southern Rhodesian team had won the World Pairs Trophy and the individual competition at Bogota.

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 24 September 1975 was sent to Colombia, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below:

"The Committee would like to refer to the note dated 14 January 1975 which, at its request, the Secretary-General addressed to the Permanent Representative of Colombia bringing to his attention a press report according to which an organization called the Rhodesian Golf Union had accepted an invitation to the World Pairs Championships in Bogota in August 1975. In its reply dated 8 July 1975, the Government of Colombia transmitted copy of a letter dated 2 May 1975 from the President of the Colombian Golf Federation according to which the invitation had been withdrawn.

"Since then, the Committee has received information from published sources that, nevertheless, the Rhodesian team participated in Bogota's championships and won various trophies.

"The Committee expressed its surprise at such information and requested the Secretary-General to ask the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter.

"In case the Rhodesian team would have eventually participated in the tournament, the Committee would like to be informed of all the details available on the circumstances of that participation. In particular, the Committee would like to know the names of the Rhodesian participants, the type and country of origin of their travelling documents, as well as the financial facilities given to the team.

"Also the Committee would be grateful to be informed of the measures taken by the Government in connexion with that case and of the dispositions taken in case of possible similar attempts of that sort in the future.

"The Committee would appreciate receiving the comments and information referred to above at the earliest convenience of His Excellency's Government and, if possible, within a month."

7. A first reminder was sent to Colombia on 4 December 1975.

(180) Case No. 199. Golf championships in the Dominican Republic (1974):
information obtained from published sources

1. In October 1974 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a team of golfers from Southern Rhodesia arrived in Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic, on 21 October 1974, for the purpose of participating in the Eisenhower Trophy World Tournament there.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 239th meeting, a note dated 24 June 1975 was sent to the Dominican Republic, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the possibility of participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such an event was of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia would be in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions.

3. A first reminder was sent to the Dominican Republic on 25 August, a second reminder on 1 October and a third reminder on 19 November 1975.

4. A reply dated 8 December 1975 was received from the Dominican Republic, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Dominican Republic ... has the honour to inform /the Secretary-General/ that the competent Dominican authorities have established that, through an unfortunate oversight, some citizens of Southern Rhodesia participated in an international sports event held in the Republic in October 1974.

"The Government of the Dominican Republic wishes expressly to reaffirm that it maintains its traditional policy of full respect for and compliance with the principles and norms governing international life and that accordingly, in the specific matter in question, it will continue faithfully to comply with the Security Council provisions concerning the sanctions imposed on the Government of Southern Rhodesia and regrets the oversight which gave rise to the requests in the notes referred to above."

(181) Case No. 205. Irish rugby team tour of Southern Rhodesia: information
obtained from published sources

1. At the 233rd meeting on 10 April 1975, the representative of Iraq drew the attention of the Committee to information obtained from published sources according

to which the Public Schools Wanderers rugby team would be touring Rhodesia and participating in five matches on 7, 10, 14, 17 and 19 May 1975. The Committee's particular attention was drawn to the fact that the team would reportedly include nine Irish internationals, one of whom would captain it.

2. After considering that information, the Committee decided that an appropriate note should be prepared for its approval, under the no-objection procedure, for transmission to Ireland requesting the Government of Ireland to take all possible measures to prevent the occurrence of any activities by Irish nationals which would, in the view of the Committee, be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

3. In accordance with the decision of the Committee, a note dated 24 April 1975 was sent to Ireland, under the no-objection procedure, stating as indicated above.

4. A first reminder was sent to Ireland on 24 June 1975.

5. In the absence of a reply from Ireland, the Committee included that Government in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.

6. A reply dated 29 July 1975 was received from Ireland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Government of Ireland are deeply conscious of their obligation under the Charter of the United Nations to give effect to binding decisions of the Security Council. Ireland has fully applied the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Council on Southern Rhodesia and will continue to do so.

"While the Irish Government have in the past taken and will continue to take whatever steps are open to them to discourage visits to Southern Rhodesia, the Government are not in a position to prevent private visits of the kind referred to in the Secretary-General's note."

(182) Case No. 211. Tour of certain European countries by Southern Rhodesian hockey club: information obtained from published sources

1. In May 1975, the Committee obtained information from published sources, according to which a hockey team from Southern Rhodesia travelled to Austria and played a match there against the Austrian under-23 team on 1 May; the team had then travelled to the Federal Republic of Germany and played a match there against the national reserve team on 4 May 1975. The information also stated that the Southern Rhodesian team had subsequently travelled to Spain and planned to play three matches there against a Spanish junior select team on 6 May, the Real Polo Club of Barcelona on 7 May and against the Club Egara on 8 May 1975, respectively.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 241st meeting, notes dated 7 July 1975 were sent to Austria, Federal Republic of Germany and Spain, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The notes also expressed the Committee's concern

at the possibility of participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in sports events abroad, particularly if such events were of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia would be in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions.

3. An acknowledgement dated 11 July and a reply dated 25 August 1975 were received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

4. The substantive part of the reply reads as follows:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany was informed by the competent sport association, the Deutscher Hockey Bund e.V., that the Rhodesian hockey club 'The Sabres' participated in various matches in Europe from 20 April to 8 May 1975.

"During this time also some games took place in the Federal Republic of Germany against German teams. However, the matches were not organized by the Deutscher Hockey Bund, but by local hockey clubs.

"It was further ascertained that the voyage was carried out by the Portuguese airlines TAP and that all the travelling expenses were met by the visitors themselves, who entered the Federal Republic of Germany with British, South African and Portuguese passports respectively. Two or three of the Rhodesian hockey players apparently had to stay behind because they did not succeed in obtaining passports from other countries.

"In this connexion, the Deutscher Hockey Bund pointed out that according to the statutes of the association its members are free to play against any other member of the International Hockey Federation (IHF). This applies also to Southern Rhodesia, which is member of this federation.

"Under these circumstances it seems that the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia imposed by the Security Council have not been violated."

5. First reminders were sent to Austria and Spain on 8 September 1975.

6. A reply dated 11 September 1975 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Investigations carried out by the competent Austrian authorities after receiving the relevant information provided by the Committee ... have shown that a number of hockey matches, such as the one referred to in the newspaper report transmitted with the above cited note, have indeed been played in Austria by a hockey club from Southern Rhodesia.

"All the members of this team, with one exception, entered Austria with British passports. On the basis of existing agreements between Austria and

the United Kingdom, the Austrian authorities have no possibility to refuse entry to holders of British passports.

"It might be further pointed out that the matches were played in a strictly local context and were neither given publicity in the Austrian public, nor did they receive mention in the Austrian press."

7. A second reminder was sent to Spain on 13 October 1975.
8. A reply dated 14 October 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"With reference to your notes dated 7 July and 8 September 1975, and on instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you that in May 1975 the Rhodesian national hockey team asked to hold some matches in Spain and their request was refused by the Spanish Hockey Federation.

"Furthermore, the Spanish sports authorities made the appropriate investigation and found no evidence that any Rhodesian team or players had participated in sports competitions, even on a friendly basis, in Spain. For the dates referred to in the press report annexed to the aforementioned notes there is evidence only that two Catalan clubs were hosts to a European club, in matches of a completely private nature, but not to any Rhodesian team."

(183) Case No. 215. Southern Rhodesia and the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGS): information obtained from published sources

1. In June 1975 the Committee received information from published sources according to which a delegation of the so-called Southern Rhodesia Girl Guides' Association and Girl Scouts would attend the 22nd congress of WAGGS scheduled to open in Sussex, England, on 23 June. It was the first year that Southern Rhodesia would be represented as a full member of WAGGS, having been elected to that status at the Toronto, Canada, conference in 1972.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, a note dated 6 August 1975 was sent to the United Kingdom, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also stated that, should the information be correct, the Committee considered that the participation of a Southern Rhodesian delegation in that conference could be exploited to enhance the position of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia; such a development would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council, and in such circumstances the admission into the territory of a State Member of the United Nations of particular persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia is in conflict with the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

3. A reply dated 2 September 1975 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The press report which is the subject of this note was circulated to all members of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia. As a member of the Committee, the United Kingdom delegation reported the facts to the appropriate authorities in London, who immediately undertook the necessary investigations. The investigations revealed that the newspaper report was substantially accurate.

"The organizers of the 22nd Conference of the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts had invited four guides from Southern Rhodesia to attend the Conference. Two members of the delegation were United Kingdom citizens and therefore held United Kingdom passports, but the other two did not. Since the United Kingdom passport holders were white and the other two were not, the United Kingdom authorities took the view that they should issue concessionary United Kingdom passports to the two African guides in order to ensure that the party was balanced and that the Southern Rhodesian Girl Guide Association should be given the opportunity to demonstrate that it was a multiracial organization. This was done against an assurance that guiding in Southern Rhodesia is multiracial, non-political and educational. The issue of the concessionary United Kingdom passports was therefore deemed to be consistent with the relevant United Nations Security Council resolution.

"It was also made clear to the organizers that the attendance of these girl guides from Southern Rhodesia was acquiesced in on condition that the party concerned was representing the Southern Rhodesian Girl Guide Association and not in any way the illegal régime. The organizers were instructed to ensure that the party should be described as coming from Southern Rhodesia rather than from Rhodesia, and that it should not use any of the trappings of the illegal régime, such as flags, nameplates etc."

(184) Case No. 216. United States basketball coach tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In June 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a basketball coach from the United States, Ronald Wyckoff, would be touring Southern Rhodesia for three months, during which period he would hold basketball clinics at schools and clubs in Salisbury, Bulawayo, Gwelo and Umtali.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting on 17 July 1975, a note was prepared for transmission to the United States, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. Before the note was dispatched, the representative of the United States made a statement on the matter at the 245th meeting on 31 July 1975, the text of which is reproduced below:

"Appropriate American authorities are actively engaged in gathering whatever information may become available concerning an American basketball coach who allegedly is holding a series of basketball clinics in schools in Southern Rhodesia. I hope to have that information available for the Committee within the next few weeks and will report to the Committee at that time."

3. At the 254th meeting on 13 November 1975, the representative of the United States made a further statement to the Committee, the text of which is reproduced below:

"Further to my statement of 31 July concerning Case 216, I am able to inform the Committee that Mr. Ronald Wyckoff visited Southern Rhodesia in a private capacity. He had no official status; nor was he representing the Cates School. We have obtained this information as a result of the inquiries which I indicated we would pursue since that time."

(185) Case No. 217. Visit to Southern Rhodesia by Argentinian hockey umpire: information obtained from published sources.

1. In June 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which an Argentinian hockey umpire, known as Horatio Servetto and described as the best umpire in the world, was scheduled to make an eight-day visit of Southern Rhodesia, during which he would undertake various hockey activities under the auspices of the so-called Rhodesian Hockey Umpires Association. The information further stated that Mr. Servetto had officiated in the 1972 Olympics final in Munich, in the World Cup final in 1973 and in the Europe-against-Asia anniversary match in 1974.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, a note dated 6 August 1975 was sent to Argentina, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern that, if the information thus received was correct, the visit to Southern Rhodesia by a prominent Argentinian sports official could be exploited to enhance the position of the illegal régime; such a development would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council.

3. A reply dated 25 August 1975 was received from the Permanent Representative of Argentina, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"On instructions from my Government, I wish to convey the following information:

"(a) Mr. Servetto's journey was purely private and personal.

"(b) He is resident in Spain, where the invitation was presumably sent to him and whence he departed for Rhodesia.

"(c) Consequently, the competent Argentine authorities had no knowledge of the journey and could not have discouraged Mr. Servetto from undertaking it.

"(d) Mr. Servetto is not at present a member of the Argentine Hockey Umpires Association but of the International Association, with headquarters in Brussels, Belgium.

"(e) Furthermore, the authorities of the Argentine Republic have no legal power to impede or prevent private travel by Argentine citizens, since the National Constitution guarantees them the right to enter, stay in, travel through and leave the country freely.

"(f) It is appropriate to recall that, as the then Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Argentine Republic, Mr. Eduardo McLoughlin, indicated at the 1664th meeting of the Security Council on 28 September 1972, all sporting activities with Southern Rhodesia were prohibited by Act 19846/72.

"(g) The Government of the Argentine Republic greatly regrets that, simply on the basis of a press report referring to an isolated episode of very minor importance, the Committee should have thought it necessary to express its "disappointment" and trusts that the above information will be helpful in the tasks entrusted to it under Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and other Council resolutions.

"(h) In conclusion, I would request that, when the Committee meets to consider this question, it will allow me to be present so that I may have an opportunity to comment on the matter."

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 250th meeting, a letter dated 30 October and a note dated 11 November 1975 were sent to the Secretary-General of the International Hockey Federation (FIH) and to Argentina, respectively under the no-objection procedure. The substantive texts of the letter and the note are reproduced below:

(i) Letter to the Secretary-General of FIH

"I have been requested by the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia to draw your attention to information that has been received by the Committee from published sources. According to that information, an Argentine hockey umpire named Horatio Servetto, and described as a member of the International Association, visited Southern Rhodesia during the latter part of June 1975 and took part in various activities with local hockey umpires. The information further states that Mr. H. Servetto had officiated in the 1972 Olympics final in Munich, the World Cup final in 1973 and in the Europe against Asia anniversary match in 1974. A copy of the relevant newspaper article is attached for ease of reference.

"The Committee, whose membership is the same as that of the Security Council, is entrusted by the Council with various duties in connexion with the application of the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee views with serious concern any action which might enhance the status of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or provide the possibility of a breach of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

"In that connexion, the Committee decided at its 250th meeting that the above information should be drawn to the attention of the International Hockey Federation, requesting any clarification which the Federation might be able to give concerning the status of Mr. H. Servetto and the nature of his reported visit to Southern Rhodesia. The Committee would be particularly interested to know in what capacity the visit was made, and what financial arrangements were made to facilitate its occurrence.

"The Committee would welcome receiving an early reply, if possible within a month."

(ii) Note to Argentina

"The Committee examined carefully His Excellency's reply dated 25 August 1975 concerning the case referred to above and expressed its appreciation at its prompt reply. The Committee considered that the information thus provided was satisfactory. The Committee also decided that under the circumstances it was not necessary for the Permanent Representative to appear before it to comment further on the matter as he had kindly offered to do. If the Permanent Representative of Argentina, however, does have any information that is of a particular interest to the Committee, he should feel free to communicate such information to the Chairman of the Committee.

"The Committee expressed the hope that His Excellency's Government would continue to exert vigilance to ensure that the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia are fully implemented."

5. A reply dated 10 November 1975 was received from the Secretary-General of the International Hockey Federation, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As a preliminary general remark, allow me to state that this Federation is an independent body governing the sport of hockey throughout the world without allegiance to any State or any political organization.

"Seventy-four affiliated National Hockey Associations enjoy full membership of the FIH and among them the Rhodesian Hockey Association, which was admitted in 1961. It belongs to each one of the seventy-three other member Associations to decide if they agree or not to play against Southern Rhodesia at home and/or away.

"To come to the object of your letter, I have been told that Mr. Servetto, who was touring Southern Rhodesia in June last as a member of a private party, was asked by the Rhodesia Hockey Association to give a lecture to their local umpires, and he agreed to do so.

"Mr. Servetto is indeed a Grade I International Umpire but he is in no way a member of the International Federation. Besides and contrary to what you write, he is not described as such in the cuttings attached to your letter of 30 October.

"On the other hand, as he toured Southern Rhodesia in his personal capacity, I am unable to inform you on his journey."

6. In view of the fact that the so-called Rhodesian Hockey Association had continued to enjoy full membership of FIH since 1961, and in accordance with the Committee's practice in similar, past cases, m/ the Committee decided, under the no-objection procedure, that an appropriate note should be sent to all Member States whose national hockey associations are affiliated with FIH, and a further letter to FIH itself, appealing for any action that might result in the expulsion of Southern Rhodesia from FIH. The substantive texts of the letter and the note are reproduced below:

(i) Note dated 15 December 1975 to all Member States concerned

"According to information recently received by the Committee, the so-called Rhodesian Hockey Association has been permitted to continue enjoying full membership of the International Hockey Federation since its admission in 1961.

"The Committee, which is concerned at the possibility of violation of the sanctions against the illegal régime, and in particular, paragraph 5 (a) and (b) of resolution 253 (1968), furthermore considers that accession to membership of a Rhodesian association in an international organization is likely to encourage further the illegal régime in its unlawful actions. Thus, the Committee is bringing the matter to the attention of the International Hockey Federation, urging it to support the implementation of the sanctions, both in letter and in spirit, and recommending that the Southern Rhodesian association be expelled forthwith from membership of the Federation.

"The Committee would be grateful if His Excellency's Government could draw this matter to the attention of hockey associations under its jurisdiction and impress on them the seriousness of the matter.

m/ See, e.g. (169) Case No. 120, (177) Case No. 181, (186) Case No. 219, and (187) Case No. 220.

"In that connexion, the Committee would like to recall paragraph 16 of its second special report (Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1973), which, as approved by Security Council resolution 333 (1973), reads as follows:

"The Committee thinks that awareness on the part of Member States of the whole purpose of the United Nations sanctions policy is vital and, therefore, that it should periodically request Member States to draw the attention of their public to the importance of the relevant United Nations resolutions."

(ii) Letter dated 11 December 1975 to the Secretary-General of FIH

"At the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to refer to your letter of 10 November 1975 and the information contained therein, of which the Committee has taken note.

"However, as was previously brought to your attention, the Committee is entrusted by the Council with various duties in connexion with the application of the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and views with serious concern any action which might enhance the status of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or provide the possibility of a breach of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council. It was therefore with great concern that it learnt that the Southern Rhodesian association has been permitted to continue enjoying full membership of the International Hockey Federation since its admission in 1961.

"The Committee examined the matter carefully and requested me to appeal to you, and through you to your organization, in the hope that in order to have the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council implemented both in letter and in spirit the International Hockey Federation would decide to expel forthwith the Southern Rhodesian association from membership of the Federation.

"The Committee also indicated that it would appreciate it if this communication could be circulated to all national hockey associations members of FIH."

(186) Case No. 219. Southern Rhodesia and the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF): information obtained from published sources

1. In July 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which Southern Rhodesia had been readmitted to the Davis Cup tennis competitions at a meeting of ILTF held in Barcelona, Spain. The information further indicated that Southern Rhodesia had been drawn to play against Ireland in a match scheduled for the end of September 1975.
2. At the 245th meeting on 31 July 1975, the Committee decided that communications

should be prepared for its consideration, under the no-objection procedure, as follows: (a) a note to all Member States whose national tennis associations were members of ILTF, deploring the readmission of Southern Rhodesia into that organization; and (b) a separate note to Ireland suggesting that the Irish team should refuse to play against the Southern Rhodesian team in the Davis Cup match and (c) a letter from the Chairman of ILTF expressing the Committee's disappointment at Southern Rhodesia's readmission into that organization.

3. On the same day, a letter dated 31 July 1975 addressed to the secretariat of the Committee was received from the Chargé d'affaires of Ireland to the United Nations, indicating that his Government was dealing with that matter and would keep the Committee informed.

4. A further communication dated 11 August 1975 was received from the Chargé d'affaires of Ireland to the United Nations, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to submit for your information the text of a letter dated 7 August 1975 conveyed on behalf of Dr. Garret FitzGerald, Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Secretary of the Irish Lawn Tennis Association. A reply from the Irish Lawn Tennis Association is awaited."

Enclosure

"I am directed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs to refer to your letter of 22 July 1975 regarding the proposed Davis Cup match between Ireland and Southern Rhodesia and to your request for information as to Ireland's obligations under international law in this regard.

"As you are aware, the régime in Southern Rhodesia is illegal and is the subject of mandatory sanctions imposed by resolutions of the Security Council of the United Nations. Resolutions of the Security Council are binding on all Member States, and, consequently, the Government is obliged under international law to carry out their provisions.

"Paragraph 5 (b) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 provides that all States Members of the United Nations shall:

'Take all possible measures to prevent the entry into their territories of persons whom they have reason to believe to be ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia and whom they have reason to believe to have furthered or encouraged, or to be likely to further or encourage, the unlawful actions of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or any activities which are calculated to evade any measure decided upon in this resolution or resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966.'

"The Minister considers that participation in an international competition such as the proposed Davis Cup match by persons purporting to represent

Southern Rhodesia in a national capacity would be at variance with the provisions of resolution 253 (1968) and could encourage the unlawful actions of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

"In these circumstances the Minister would be grateful if the Irish Lawn Tennis Association would assist him in discharging our international obligation to respect the decisions of the Security Council by declining to proceed with the proposed match.

"If the governing body of the ILTF feels unable to meet the Minister's request, the matter will have to be considered further. I would be grateful, therefore, if you could inform the Department, as soon as possible, of the governing body's decision."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision indicated in paragraph 2 above, the proposed notes were sent to Ireland on 24 September and to all Member States whose tennis associations were members of ILTF on 30 September, and the proposed letter was sent to the General Secretary of ILTF on 26 September 1975.

6. Acknowledgements were received from the Federal Republic of Germany (6 October), Canada (29 October) and Austria (4 November 1975).

7. Replies were received from the General Secretary of ILTF and Ireland, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(a) Letter dated 7 October 1975 from the General Secretary of ILTF

"This matter will be placed before the Committee of Management of the Davis Cup and the Committee of Management of the ILTF at their meetings later this month."

(b) Note dated 9 October 1975 from Ireland

"The Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations has the honour, on behalf of the Government of Ireland, to acknowledge the Committee's expression of appreciation for its action in regard to a proposed Davis Cup match between Ireland and Southern Rhodesia. The Permanent Representative is pleased to confirm that, as the Committee will no doubt be aware, the Southern Rhodesian team has withdrawn from the proposed match. The Irish Government, mindful of the obligations under the terms of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), was careful to maintain the closest possible contact with the Irish Lawn Tennis Association throughout developments relating to the proposed match. While the Government did not receive a formal reply to the letter of 7 August, sent to the Secretary of the Irish Lawn Tennis Association on behalf of the Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs, it was on the basis of the contacts which were established that the Government was informally advised of the decision on the part of the Southern Rhodesian team to withdraw, permitting the Irish Davis Cup team to go through the second round of the competition.

"The Permanent Representative is in receipt of the Committee's note of 30 September bringing the matter of the readmission of the so-called Rhodesia Lawn Tennis Association into the Davis Cup Tennis competition to the attention of Member States. The contents of the Committee's note has been brought to the attention of the Irish Government."

8. The Committee took note of the additional information supplied by Ireland.

9. Further to paragraph 7 (a) above, a reply dated 20 November 1975 was received from the Secretary of the Davis Cup Nations, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Your letter of 26 September (Case 219) has now been received by the Davis Cup Committee of Management, and they have asked me to point out to you the following facts.

"The Rhodesian Lawn Tennis Association is affiliated to the International Lawn Tennis Federation, and eligible to compete in the Davis Cup Competition. Rhodesia submitted their entry for the 1976 Competition and at the Annual General Meeting of the Davis Cup held in July this year in London, none of those present objected to its acceptance.

"The draw for the Competition was made here in London on 4 July, and Rhodesia was drawn against Ireland in the 2nd round. At a later date, the Irish Lawn Tennis Association said that it would not be possible for them to play against Rhodesia, and therefore they were prepared to withdraw from the Competition. Upon hearing this the Rhodesian Lawn Tennis Association withdrew from the Davis Cup Competition 1976 'to ensure a satisfactory Competition for all nations'.

"My Committee has asked me to inform you that Rhodesia remains a member of the International Lawn Tennis Federation and will remain so unless or until, they withdraw of their own free will or their membership is terminated by the required majority under the rules of the International Lawn Tennis Federation."

10. A communication dated 2 December 1975 was also received from India, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations ... has the honour to state that India maintains a complete boycott of the racist illegal minority régime of Southern Rhodesia and that this extends to participation in sports events also. Consistent with this policy, the Government of India has informed the All India Lawn Tennis Association of the contents of the Secretary-General's note referred to above so that appropriate action is taken."

(187) Case No. 220. Southern Rhodesia and the International Amateur Swimming Federation (FINA): information obtained from published sources

1. In July 1975, the Committee received information from published sources according to which FINA might lift the ban imposed against Southern Rhodesia in 1973 and readmit that country as a full member of FINA, apparently on the ground that the country had achieved racial integration in swimming sports.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a letter dated 26 September was sent to the President of FINA and a note dated 30 September 1975 was sent to all Member States whose swimming associations are members of FINA. The substantive parts of the letter and the note are reproduced below:

(i) Letter from the Chairman of the Committee to the President of the International Amateur Swimming Federation (FINA)

"At the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to draw your attention to information that has been obtained by the Committee from published sources to the effect that the International Amateur Swimming Federation might lift its ban against Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee, whose membership is the same as that of the Security Council, is entrusted by the Council with various duties in connexion with the application of the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and views with serious concern any action which might enhance the status of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or provide the possibility of a breach of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council. It was therefore with great concern that the Committee received the information reported above.

"The Committee examined the matter carefully and requested me to appeal to you, and through you to the International Federation, in the hope that in order to have the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council implemented both in letter and in spirit the International Amateur Swimming Federation would refrain from taking the decision indicated above.

"The Committee also indicated that it would appreciate it if this communication could be circulated to all national swimming associations members of FINA."

(ii) Note to all Member States whose swimming associations are members of FINA

"According to press reports published in Southern Rhodesia and recently received by the Committee, the International Amateur Swimming Federation may decide to readmit Southern Rhodesia as one of its members.

"The Committee which is concerned at the possibility of violation of the sanctions against the illegal régime and, in particular, paragraph 5 (a) and (b) of resolution 253 (1968), furthermore considers that accession to

membership of a Rhodesian association in an international organization is likely to encourage further the illegal régime in its unlawful actions. Thus, the Committee has brought the matter to the attention of the International Amateur Swimming Federation, urging it to continue to support the implementation of the sanctions, both in letter and in spirit, and recommending that Southern Rhodesia not be readmitted.

"The Committee would be grateful if His Excellency's Government could draw this matter to the attention of swimming associations under its jurisdiction and impress on them the seriousness of the matter.

"In that connexion, the Committee would like to recall paragraph 16 of its second special report (Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June), which, as approved by Security Council resolution 333 (1973), reads as follows:

'The Committee thinks that awareness on the part of Member States of the whole purpose of the United Nations sanctions policy is vital and, therefore, that it should periodically request Member States to draw the attention of their public to the importance of the relevant United Nations resolutions.'

3. Acknowledgements were received from El Salvador (6 October), the Federal Republic of Germany (6 October), Canada (29 October), Austria (4 November) and Zaire (18 November 1975).

4. Communications were received from El Salvador and India, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 28 November 1975 from El Salvador

"The Permanent Mission of El Salvador to the United Nations ... has the honour to state that it has been informed by the Olympic Committee of El Salvador that, in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), the Salvadorian position will be to oppose the readmission of Southern Rhodesia to membership in the International Amateur Swimming Federation."

(ii) Note dated 2 December 1975 from India

"The Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations ... has the honour to state that India maintains a complete boycott of the racist illegal minority régime of Southern Rhodesia and that this extends to participation in sports events also. Consistent with this policy, the Government of India has informed the Swimming Federation of India of the contents of the Secretary-General's note referred to above so that appropriate action is taken."

5. A letter dated 8 December 1975 was also received from the President of FINA, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Your letter dated 26 September 1975 is acknowledged with apologies for the late reply due to travel commitments which I have had during these past two months.

"Your concern regarding the Rhodesian Amateur Swimming Federation is noted and I shall pass this concern on to my colleagues in the FINA Bureau at our next meeting."

(188) Case No. 222. Participation of Southern Rhodesian yachtsman in World Fireball Regatta, France: information obtained from published sources

1. In October 1973 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a Southern Rhodesian yachtsman had made a two-month visit of certain European countries, during which he had participated in the World Fireball Regatta in France, winning second place, and had also won the French national fireball regatta. The information also indicated that the Southern Rhodesian flag had been flown both at the opening ceremonies of the regatta and at the presentation of the winner's medal to the Southern Rhodesian competitor.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 17 October 1975 was sent to France, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting the Government to undertake the necessary investigations so as to determine, and inform the Committee of the circumstances in which the sportsman in question was admitted into France, his full name and any details of his travel documents and the transport facilities which he used from and to Southern Rhodesia.

(189) Case No. 223. International squash tournament in Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In September 1975 the Committee received information, according to which an international squash tournament was held in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, during that month, in which individuals from Australia, Canada, Egypt, Pakistan and the United Kingdom had participated.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, notes dated 20 October 1975 were sent to Australia, Canada, Egypt, Pakistan and the United Kingdom, transmitting a copy of the source of the information. The notes also drew the attention of each Government concerned to the fact that such participation in sports events in Southern Rhodesia enhanced the position of the illegal régime there and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee had, therefore, asked the Secretary-General to request each Government concerned to investigate the travel, banking and other arrangements that had facilitated the participation of the foreign nationals concerned in the tournament.

3. Replies were received from Canada, Pakistan and the United Kingdom, the substantive parts of which are reproduced below:

(i) Note dated 29 October 1975 from Canada (also covering Case No. 224)

"The Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to Case Nos. 223 and 224 ... concerning, in the first instance, the question of the participation of a Canadian squash player in an international squash tournament held in Southern Rhodesia, and, in the second, concerning the participation of two Southern Rhodesian ploughmen in the September 1975 World Ploughing Match in Canada.

"These two communications are being forwarded to the Canadian authorities, who will give them the close and early attention which they have always given to such communications from the Secretary-General which have been made at the request of the Security Council Committee. The Permanent Mission of Canada wishes to point out, however, that the suggested period within which the Security Council Committee hopes to receive a reply, namely, one month, will normally be insufficient, particularly if the facts of the cases concerned are not instantly available. We note that the time limit has been amended from that previously employed, namely, two months. We consider that this proposed time limit is unrealistic and would request that the Committee return to its previous practice, with which the Canadian Government has made concerted efforts to comply."

(ii) Note dated 28 October 1975 from Pakistan

"The Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations ... has the honour to state that the squash player mentioned in the press report is no longer a Pakistani citizen. He is a naturalized Canadian now, as has also been acknowledged by the correspondent of The Rhodesian Herald. It is therefore suggested that the Government of Canada be approached by the Security Council Committee in connexion with his reported visit to Southern Rhodesia to participate in a sports tournament.

"The contents of the note have been communicated to the Government of Pakistan, which would undoubtedly strengthen existing measures against contravention of resolution 253 (1968)."

(iii) Note dated 4 November 1975 from the United Kingdom

"The competent British authorities have looked into the question of participation by a British national (Jonah Barrington) in this tournament. They have discovered that his participation in a tournament held at the Salisbury Squash Club was part of an international tour he was making in a private capacity. He did not infringe existing sanctions regulations by taking funds from the United Kingdom to Southern Rhodesia, since all his expenses in Southern Rhodesia were met by the organizers of the tournament. He travelled to Southern Rhodesia from South Africa, where he had been taking part in other squash tournaments.

"Investigations also made clear that Mr. Jonah Barrington travelled on his tour in a purely private capacity and did not represent in any way an official or semi-official British team. The United Kingdom Government have long held the view that no British sportsmen or sporting teams should participate in sporting events in Southern Rhodesia. They will continue to make known to those concerned their opposition to such visits."

(190) Case No. 224. Participation of Southern Rhodesia in World Ploughing Match, Canada: information obtained from published sources

1. In October 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a team of two ploughmen from Southern Rhodesia had participated in a five-day World Ploughing Match at Oshawa, near Toronto, Canada, in September 1975.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, concerning sports events, a note dated 20 October 1975 was sent to Canada, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information, and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the possibility of participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such an event was of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia would be in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions.

3. A reply dated 29 October 1975 was received from Canada, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 3 (i) of (189) Case No. 223, above.

(191) Case No. 225. Visit of English polo team to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In September 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a polo team from England known as Corsley travelled to Southern Rhodesia earlier that month and participated in several polo championship matches there.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 29 October 1975 was sent to the United Kingdom, transmitting a copy of the source of the information, requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that such participation in a sports event in Southern Rhodesia enhanced the position of the illegal régime there, and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee therefore requested the Government to investigate the circumstances of that visit, including, in particular, the banking, travel and other arrangements that facilitated the travel of the team to and from Southern Rhodesia.

(192) Case No. 226. International Wanderers Cricket team visit to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In September 1975 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a 12-man cricket team, the International Wanderers, would tour Southern Rhodesia starting on 21 September 1975. The team was to be composed of players from New Zealand, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the West Indies.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, notes dated 29 October 1975 were sent under the no-objection procedure, to New Zealand, Pakistan and the United Kingdom, transmitting a copy of the source of the information. The note also expressed the possibility of participation of a team of foreign nationals in a sports event in Southern Rhodesia, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime there; the Committee therefore wished to know how the banking, travel and other arrangements had been organized to facilitate the visit of the individual members of the team concerned to Southern Rhodesia.
3. A note of the same date was similarly sent to Trinidad and Tobago, the seat of the West Indian Cricketing Board of Control. The note requested information concerning the names of the members of the team described as being from the West Indies, as well as the banking, travel and other arrangements that had facilitated the visit of those members to Southern Rhodesia as part of the International Wanderers.
4. A reply dated 11 December 1975 was received from Trinidad and Tobago, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The West Indies Cricketing Board of Control is an Association of national cricketing authorities in the West Indies with a rotating Chairman. The present Chairman of the Board of Control is a national of Trinidad and Tobago.

"The West Indies Cricketing Board of Control exercises control over individual West Indian cricketers only insofar as their participation as members of a West Indies cricket team engaging in internationally recognized test tours is concerned.

"The two cricketers to whom reference has been made as participants in a cricketing team to tour Southern Rhodesia, it should be pointed out, are nationals of Barbados. Any investigation therefore into the arrangements which permitted the two cricketers to travel to Southern Rhodesia and participate in cricketing matches there should properly be undertaken by the Government of Barbados."

(193) Case 228. Visit of Southern Rhodesian karate coach to France: information obtained from published sources

1. In October 1975 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which Barry Stranack, described as a Southern Rhodesian national karate coach, had visited France and undertaken a three-week training course in Paris.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 12 November 1975 was sent to France, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting the Government to undertake the necessary investigations so as to determine, and inform the Committee of, the circumstances in which the sportsman in question was admitted into France and any details of his travel documents and the transport facilities which he used from and back to Southern Rhodesia.

(194) Case No. 229. Participation of Southern Rhodesian player in the International Tennis Championships in Spain: information obtained from published sources

1. In October 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a Southern Rhodesian player named Colin Dowdeswell had travelled to Spain and participated in the International Tennis Championships there.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 14 November 1975 was sent to Spain, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting the Government to undertake the necessary investigations so as to determine, and inform the Committee of, the circumstances in which the sportsman in question was admitted into Spain and any details of his travel documents and the transport facilities which he used from and back to Southern Rhodesia.

(195) Case No. 230. Participation of Southern Rhodesian in the commemorative marathon in Greece: information obtained from published sources

1. In October 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a Southern Rhodesian named Chris Charlton was due to travel to Greece, where he would participate in the commemorative marathon run from Marathon to Athens, scheduled to take place in the last week of October 1975.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 24 November 1975 was sent to Greece, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting the Government to undertake the necessary investigations so as to determine, and inform the Committee of, the circumstances in which the sportsman in question might have been admitted into Greece and, if so, any details of his travel documents and the transport facilities which he might have used from and back to Southern Rhodesia.

(196) Case No. 231. Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the Dewar Tennis Cup matches: information obtained from published sources

1. In November 1975, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which two Southern Rhodesians had entered the Dewar Tennis Cup matches to be played in Edinburgh and London, United Kingdom, between 6 and 15 November 1975. The names of the Southern Rhodesians were given as Andrew Pattison and Colin Dowdeswell.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 24 November 1975 was sent to the United Kingdom, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting the Government to undertake the necessary investigations so as to determine, and inform the Committee of, the circumstances in which the sportsmen in question were admitted into the United Kingdom and any details of their travel documents and the transport facilities which they used from and back to Southern Rhodesia.

(197) Case No. 234. Visit of the American All-Stars College Basketball Team to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In November 1975 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which the American All-Stars College Basketball Team had played three matches in Southern Rhodesia during the week-end of 11 October 1975.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note was prepared for transmission to the United States, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. Before the note was dispatched, the representative of the United States made a statement on the matter at the 255th meeting on 20 November 1975, the text of which is reproduced below:

"I have referred to my Government the information relating to a reported visit of an American All-Stars College Basketball Team to Southern Rhodesia. Investigations have revealed that the team had no official status either from any college or from the United States Government."

M. BANKING, INSURANCE AND OTHER RELATED FACILITIES

(198) Case No. 163. Swiss company loan to Rhodesia Railways: United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Switzerland, the Committee included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
4. A reply dated 14 March 1975 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"On 13 March 1975, the Committee issued the sixth list, covering the period up to 31 January 1975, of the Governments that had not replied within the two-month time-limit to the Committee's questions regarding possible violations of sanctions. In the list mention was made inter alia of the Swiss Government in connexion with Case No. 163, Swiss company loan to Southern Rhodesia. Yet, on 25 September 1974, the Observer had sent the Secretary-General a note on this matter which read as follows:

'The investigation of this case conducted by the Federal authorities gives no basis whatever for concluding that Industrie-Maschinen Zurich, AG, agreed to, or was in any way prepared to make, a loan of \$6 million to Rhodesia Railways.

'Mr. Egli, the President of the Board of Directors and owner of the company in question, has given his formal assurance that no such transaction was contemplated or carried out by Industrie-Maschinen Zurich, AG.

'The Federal authorities would be prepared to reopen the investigation of this case if they received new and specific information calling into question the above statement.'

"On 28 October 1974, the Secretary-General, acting at the Committee's request, sent a further note to the Observer, asking if the Swiss authorities were in a position to report the results of the thorough investigation into the matter. Since this communication contained no new and specific information calling into question the results of the investigation referred to in the communication of 25 September, the Observer, in his reply of 1 November 1974 to the Secretary-General, merely referred to the position of the Swiss authorities as outlined in the above-mentioned note.

"Under the circumstances, the Observer considers he has replied to the Committee's questions concerning possible violations of sanctions and invites it to delete the name of his Government from those mentioned in the sixth list in connexion with Case No. 163."

5. At the 239th meeting on 29 May 1975, the Committee considered the matter and decided that in view of the involvement of Mr. Egli in this case, as well as in Case No. 171 (RISCO), the present case should be examined when the Committee considered Case No. 171 again.

(199) Case No. 171. Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation (RISCO): information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the Committee's special report to the Security Council (S/11597) n/ dated 15 January 1975.

2. Additional information obtained since the submission of that report is given below:

3. By a note dated 20 December 1974, published in annex IV to the special report of the Committee (S/11597), the Federal Republic of Germany provided information on the RISCO case and requested the names of "internationally renowned experts who are able reliably to distinguish Southern Rhodesian from South African steel".

4. A copy of a letter dated 26 February 1975 addressed to the President of the Commission of the European Communities by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), a non-governmental organization based in Brussels, was received from ICFTU by the Secretary-General and forwarded to the Committee. The substantive text of the letter reads as follows:

"The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) is dismayed by the report that the EEC Technical Research Committee has approved a grant of about £20,000 towards a project which will be undertaken jointly by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation, the British Pig Iron Group and their counterparts in France, Italy, Finland, Norway and Sweden.

"We should like to bring to your attention that the involvement of the Rhodesian illegal minority régime in such a project is in breach of United Nations mandatory sanctions. Moreover, such co-operation with a régime, which is consistently violating human and trade union rights and has been condemned time and again by international opinion, can only prejudice the current efforts made by African Governments to return Rhodesia to legality through a constitutional conference on the principle of one man, one vote.

"We understand that the project has still to be approved by the EEC Coal and Steel Consultative Committee. We should therefore appeal to you to use your good offices to ensure that Rhodesia's involvement in the project be rejected on the above-mentioned considerations."

5. An acknowledgement was sent to ICFTU.

6. Further to paragraph 3 above, and in accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 27 March 1975 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany enclosing the list of experts, established by the Committee in accordance with paragraph 12 of its second special report (S/10920) and published in the Committee's seventh report (see document S/11594/Rev.1, annex VIII). The note also requested the Government to submit any further relevant information that might subsequently come to light.

7. In connexion with paragraph 4 above, a letter was prepared, under the no-objection procedure, for consideration by the Committee for transmission to the President of the Commission of the European Communities. The letter would request the President to investigate the matter, particularly the circumstances in which the EEC Technical Research Committee might have approved the grant for a project in which RISCO would participate, and to take all possible measures to prevent such a grant from being effected. Before the letter could be dispatched, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement to the Committee at the 231st meeting on 27 March 1975. The text of the statement is reproduced below:

"I would like to explain to the Committee why I have asked the Secretariat not to go ahead with the dispatch of the proposed letter to the President of the Commission of the European Communities which was circulated to the Committee on 17 March 1975.

"My motive was not to attempt to shield the Commission of European Communities from the suggestion they might have been involved in a breach of sanctions. But I did wish to save this Committee's secretariat from wasting its time. When the proposed letter was circulated, I had already seen the text of a question asked in the British House of Commons on 11 March on the same subject, and a similar question asked in the House of Commons on 12 March. It was quite clear to me from these answers that no breach of sanctions was involved.

"I propose to read the texts of the two questions and replies, copies of which I will make available to the Secretariat.

"Although these answers are cast in a way which relates primarily to the British participation, which is explained easily by the fact that the questions were asked in the British Parliament, I think the Committee's members will conclude that the possibility of a breach of sanctions was avoided at an early stage and that a letter to the President of the Commission of the European Communities on the lines proposed would be a sterile exercise.

"In the light of the foregoing information, I believe that there is no point in sending the proposed letter."

The full texts of the questions and answers read out by the representative of the United Kingdom are reproduced below.

(a) Extract from House of Commons Hansard 11 March 1975

Written answers

Rhodesian Project (EEC Participation)

Mr. Hooley asked the Secretary of State for Industry (1) if he will ask the Director of Public Prosecutions to investigate, with a view to prosecution, the connivance of the British Steel Corporation in breaching sanctions against Rhodesia by becoming involved, through the EEC Technical Research Committee, in a pig iron research project to be undertaken by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation;

(2) if he will veto the proposal by the EEC Technical Research Committee to approve a grant of £20,000 for the development of a new pig iron casting process to be undertaken by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation; and if he will raise the matter at the next meeting of the Committee in connection with the maintenance of sanctions;

(3) if, at the next meeting of the EEC Coal and Steel Consultative Committee, he will raise the matter of the Committee's dealings with the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation.

Mr. Meacher, pursuant to his reply /Official Report, 3rd March 1975; Vol. 887, c. 297./, gave the following information:

The International Pig Iron Secretariat, a commercial organisation of users and producers in which the British Steel Corporation participates through the British Pig Iron Group, requested financial assistance from the European Commission towards a research project to be undertaken in France. The Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation would have made a very small financial contribution to the project. Following objections by BSC to Rhodesian participation a new proposal for the same project in which the Rhodesian Corporation will not now participate has been submitted. I understand that this is to be put to the ECSC Consultative Committee - comprising representatives of producers, trade unions and consumers - since the technical merit of the project has already been endorsed by the ECSC Technical Research Committee. Subsequently, the proposal will be scrutinised by the official level Working Group on ECSC questions. This will provide the first opportunity for Governments of member States to comment, as part of the procedure whereby the Commission is required to obtain the assent of the Council of Ministers to the assistance being sought.

There is no question of BSC being involved in any breach of sanctions against Rhodesia.

b) Telegram from the Central Office of Information, London

Item: PC fifteen Rhodesia - sanctions

"In the commons today 12 March 1975, Mr. Bryan Gould asked the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, whether it is still the policy of Her Majesty's Government to promote the international application of sanctions against the illegal Rhodesian régime.

Mr. James Callaghan: Yes, sir.

Mr. Gould: Is my right honourable friend aware that the Committee of the European Coal and Steel Community recently approved the grant of financial aid to a research project in which the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation would participate? Will he ensure, when this matter is further discussed tomorrow in Brussels by the research project Subcommittee, that the British policy of sanctions is properly represented and adhered to?

Mr. Callaghan: I understand that the International Pig Iron Secretariat has drawn up a revised proposal in which Rhodesia is not involved. I hope that that is true, because I certainly agree with my honourable friend that there should be no encouragement of EEC countries to trade with Rhodesia. At my instigation the European Community set up a committee of legal experts six months ago to try to block the loopholes."

Further to the Committee's special report (see S/11597, annex IV, item (c) under "Rhodesia"), a reply dated 2 April 1975 was received from Austria, the substantive of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations ... has the honour to transmit the following reply of the Austrian Government to several questions raised in December 1974 in the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), concerning Case No. 171 (RISCO).

"(1) At the outset, it has to be stressed again that the Austrian authorities have been carrying out from the beginning all the investigations, requested by the Committee and are still pursuing them intensively. In the course of these investigations they have not only repeatedly requested representatives of VOEST - Alpine, AG, and of Girozentrale to appear before them in order to supply necessary information but have also extended their investigations to persons who, in the meantime, have left these firms and have assumed other functions.

"The two above-mentioned firms, as well as all persons questioned, have, in the course of these investigations, fully co-operated with the Austrian authorities and have readily provided information on all questions raised.

"However, the impounding of the relevant documents and accounting books of VOEST for an official examination could not be effected, since, according to Austrian law, such a procedure is possible only in the case of a concrete indication of a punishable offence.

"(2) Regarding the particular questions raised by the sanctions Committee in December 1974, concerning the alleged participation of an Austrian firm in the expansion of the steelworks of RISCO, the following should be noted:

"Re meeting in Vienna on 8 August 1972

"Both Girozentrale and VOEST Alpine AG were subjected to detailed investigations concerning this meeting.

"The representatives of Girozentrale could not furnish any information either on the participants or on the results of the meeting, since no representative of Girozentrale had participated in this meeting and since there had been no knowledge in Girozentrale of even the scheduling of such a meeting.

"Similarly, the representatives of VOEST who were questioned could not provide any details about such a meeting.

"Re participation of Girozentrale in the financing of the expansion of RISCO

"The representatives of Girozentrale have declared that the particulars contained in the documents referring to a participation of Girozentrale in the financing of the projected expansion of RISCO in no way correspond to the facts.

"Neither with the amounts mentioned, that is, \$US 3,667,000 and \$US 5.5 million, respectively, nor with any other amounts has Girozentrale participated in this financial scheme. As proof, Girozentrale has pointed out that it does not possess any documents concerning this transaction and that, in particular, they do not have the necessary written authorization of the Austrian National Bank, which is legally indispensable in the case of any foreign currency loan.

"The representatives of Girozentrale pointed out that no business relationship existed or exists between them, on the one hand, and HGZ and the European American Financing Corporation, on the other.

"Re supplying of a continuous casting machine to RISCO

"Investigations show that VOEST did not supply a continuous casting machine to RISCO.

"A contract concerning the supplying of such a machine was, however, concluded with the South African firm NEDCO, and additional details concerning this contract are still under investigation.

"Re examination of accounts of VOEST by Austrian authorities

"As has already been mentioned, an examination of the relevant accounting books of VOEST-Alpine, AG, as was suggested by the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), in order to determine the receipt of any payments for the supply of steel-mill equipment, could not be carried out, since the legal requirements for such a procedure were lacking in the absence of an indication of a criminal act within the meaning of Austrian criminal law.

"VOEST Alpine AG does not contest in any way, however, the receipt of payments, via the banking institutes mentioned in the documentation, for steel-mill equipment supplied to the South African firm SAEPIC.

"Re relations between VOEST and the European American Financing Corporation

"According to the statements made by representatives of VOEST-Alpine, AG, VOEST has agreed to guarantee a credit in the amount of \$US 5.5 million, which was opened by EAF to SAEPIC.

"This credit was, among others, destined for the payment of steel-mill equipment supplied by VOEST to SAEPIC. In this connexion, representatives of VOEST pointed out that this transaction thus appeared in the accounts of VOEST-Alpine, AG, as an ordinary cash sale. Therefore, modalities of the transaction were such that VOEST never made or received any payments to or from either the European American Financing Corporation or the Swiss firm FEMETCO, AG, Zurich.

"Re Exports of VOEST to South Africa in the years 1972/73

"During the years 1972/73 no transactions concerning the supply of foundry products took place between VOEST and South African firms.

"Solely on the basis of individual, specific orders, machines and, in particular, lathes were delivered to South Africa, as well as the remainder of the steel-mill equipment which formed the subject of the contract of 6 December 1967 with SAEPIC.

"Re relationship between VOEST and SAEPIC

"The relations between VOEST and the South African firm SAEPIC are based on the contract of 6 December 1967, concerning the supply of steel-mill equipment.

"The supplying of any other items was not provided for in that contract.

"Re the possible supplying of steel-mill equipment by VOEST to RISCO

"In this respect reference is made to the Austrian note of 15 October 1974, in which it was clearly stated that VOEST has not had any business relations with the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. (RISCO).

"Re meeting in Paris of 18 August 1972

"On the agenda of that part of the meeting held in Paris on 18 August 1972, in which a representative of VOEST had participated as an observer, were questions of financing concerning the winding-up of the contract concluded on 6 December 1967 for the supply of steel-mill equipment, between VOEST, on the one hand, and the South African firms SAEPIC (South African Engineering Projects and Industrial Installations Consortium) and CISCO Steel Sales Co. (PTY.), Ltd., Johannesburg, on the other hand. During this discussion, the possibility of a further order concerning the supplying of additional steel-mill equipment was discussed. However, because of resolution 253 (1968) concerning Southern Rhodesia, which the Security Council had adopted in the meantime, VOEST did not show any interest in this matter.

"A protocol of the meeting was never delivered to VOEST. Since the representative of VOEST had only been present as an observer during part of it, and since he does no longer possess any personal notes concerning this meeting, he could not provide any additional details concerning the participants at the meeting.

"A similar reply was given to a note verbale of 17 January 1975 from the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Vienna, in which details concerning this meeting were requested.

"(3) It should be emphasized, in conclusion, that the Austrian Federal Government will continue to do everything possible to prevent a violation of Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Federal Government repeats its full readiness to co-operate with the Committee established in the pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) and is prepared to transmit to the Committee additional information, should this prove necessary."

9. A reply dated 7 April 1975 was also received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Acting within the framework of the legal procedures available to them, the competent Federal authorities reopened their investigation on the basis of the additional information provided by the Secretary-General in his note of 18 November 1974.

"The investigation confirmed that the contracts concluded between the Zurich firm Femetco, AG, and the Duisburg firms Neunkirchner Eisenwerke and Kloeckner and Cie involved iron and steel products declared in South Africa as

being of South African origin. This merchandise was shipped directly to the Federal Republic of Germany. The Swiss customs authorities were therefore not in a position to carry out a physical inspection or to examine the certificates of origin; nor did they have competence to do so.

"The Femetco company does not deny having been contacted in late 1972 to serve as an agent for loans from European-American Finance, Ltd. (Bermuda) to the RISCO company. In the light of objections raised by the Swiss National Bank to such a transaction after it had been approached on the matter by Femetco, the latter states that it refused to act as intermediary in the affair.

"As for the South African firms South African Steel Corporation (Pty.), Ltd. and Southern Transvaal Steel (Pty.) Ltd., it did not prove possible to establish in the investigation that Mr. Egli maintains business relations with these firms. Moreover, the Swiss authorities were not requested by any Swiss bank to approve a credit which could be drawn upon in the name of either firm.

"Thus, the Federal authorities cannot be suspected of having lent any aid whatsoever in such transactions as the Committee assumes took place."

10. A communication dated 17 April 1975 was received from the representative of the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In the course of discussion on the above case last year, the United Kingdom representative confirmed that investigations were being carried out in Bermuda into the possible involvement of European American Finance (Bermuda), Ltd., in the RISCO case. He also promised that he would report back to the Committee when the investigations were completed. Since that date, the most thorough inquiries have been carried out by the police authorities in Bermuda. I believe that the best way to make clear to the Committee the nature of these investigations and what they have discovered is to circulate the following documents:

- "1. A report of March 1975 by the Attorney-General of Bermuda;
- "2. An interim investigation report by Chief Inspector Sheehy of the Bermudan police, dated 18 June 1974;
- "3. A chart showing the loan cash flow of the RISCO transaction prepared by Detective Sergeant Rose of the Bermuda police;
- "4. Questions submitted by the Bermudan police to Mr. Klaus Jacobs (Vice-Chairman of European American Banking Corporation and President of European American Finance (Bermuda), Ltd.), together with his replies thereto;

The documents, which the representative of the United Kingdom subsequently indicated to the Committee as having been received from the Bermuda authorities on the basis of confidentiality, are kept in the Committee's secretariat files.

11. At the 235th meeting on 30 April 1975, the Committee considered the information submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom and decided that appropriate notes should be prepared for transmission to Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing copies of the documents thus received as soon as the representative of the United Kingdom would ascertain that there was no objection from the Bermuda authorities. The notes would request the Governments concerned to examine the content of the documents, in the hope that they might yield further information on the companies involved, and to transmit to the Committee any comments available on the matter. At the same meeting, the Committee also decided that the proposed letter referred to in paragraph 7 above should be dispatched, taking into account the information supplied by the representative of the United Kingdom, as indicated in that paragraph.

12. A cable dated 6 May 1975 was received from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, the text of which reads as follows:

"We want to confidentially inform you that we know personally an Austrian national who is willing to testify to VOEST's involvement in RISCO construction projects. The witness himself is in his turn able to name a number of VOEST employees who were involved in the realization of RISCO contracts with VOEST.

"We assume that testimony from first-hand witnesses is the best form of evidence for legal purposes. We therefore want to suggest that the Austrian representative be informed. If the Austrian Government would accept that this might produce the prima facie evidence for an investigation by the Vienna authorities, then we shall be prepared to arrange a meeting between a duly empowered Austrian attorney and our witness.

"We hope that we may hereby assist your Committee in its arduous task of clarifying the RISCO affair."

13. An acknowledgement was sent to the Research Group.

14. At the 236th meeting on 8 May 1975, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that the Bermuda authorities had raised no objection to transmitting their documents to the Governments of Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland, but that no such clearance had been obtained for transmission of the documents to a non-governmental organization. The Committee then decided that the proposed notes to the three Governments should be dispatched, and a letter should be sent to the Research Group, enclosing a summary of the information contained in documents to be prepared by the expert consultant.

15. At the same meeting, the Committee also decided that a letter should be prepared for transmission to the International Pig Iron Secretariat, under the no-objection procedure, as soon as that organization's address could be ascertained, urging that organization to expel RISCO from its membership and requesting a full list of the organization's membership. It was also decided

that, under the no-objection procedure, a note should be sent to Austria, transmitting the information supplied by the Research Group, requesting the Government to consider the possibility of granting an interview with the individual concerned. It was further decided that a letter should similarly be sent to the Research Group, requesting it to communicate to the Committee the name of the Austrian individual involved and the testimony that might be obtained from him, as well as any other relevant information.

16. In accordance with the Committee's decisions indicated in paragraph 14 above, the proposed notes were sent to Switzerland on 8 May and to the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria on 13 May, and the proposed letter was sent to the President of the Commission of the European Communities on 15 May 1975. The text of that letter is reproduced below:

"At the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to inform you that, recently, the Committee received information from a letter addressed to you on 26 February 1975 by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), a copy of which was sent to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, according to which the EEC Technical Research Committee had approved a grant of about £20,000 towards a project which would be undertaken jointly by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation, the British Pig Iron Group and their counterparts in France, Italy, Finland, Norway and Sweden.

"Subsequently, the Committee was informed by the Representative of the United Kingdom that, as a result of objections by the British Steel Corporation the International Pig Iron Secretariat had drawn up revised plans which, it was hoped, would not involve participation by RISCO in the proposed research project.

"The Committee examined the information thus received and decided that the matter should nevertheless be brought to your attention. In the first place, the Committee expressed great concern that a grant for a research project in which it was known that RISCO would participate was considered and approved at all. The Committee has already submitted to the Security Council a special report on RISCO, which, in the Committee's opinion, constitutes an extremely significant case of sanctions evasion. The reported action by the EEC Technical Research Committee, if carried out, could only be viewed as promoting such evasion of sanctions. The Committee would therefore welcome assurances from you that the EEC-assisted a project involving participation by Southern Rhodesia was not actually effected and that, in future, all possible measures will be taken to prevent any action or actions within the purview of the community that might be contrary to the Security Council provisions establishing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"In view of the seriousness of this matter, the Committee expressed the hope that it might receive your comments thereon at your earliest convenience if possible within a month."

17. In accordance with the Committee's decisions indicated in paragraph 15 above, the proposed note and letter were sent to Austria and to the Research Group, respectively, on 23 May 1975.

18. A further cable dated 27 May 1975 was received from the Research Group, the text of which reads as follows:

"We would like to request that the Sanctions Committee be informed of the fact that we have evidence of participation by the Austrian company, VOEST, in the RISCO project. We know personally an Austrian national who is willing to testify as an eye-witness and participant in VOEST's work on the project which took place both in Austria and in Southern Rhodesia. The witness is, in turn, in a position to provide the names of several VOEST employees who were involved in this project.

"We request, therefore, that the Security Council inform the Austrian Government that witnesses can provide the necessary evidence for a successful prosecution of VOEST. Assuming that the Austrian authorities are prepared to conduct a complete investigation and prosecution, we suggest that they contact Mr. Spilker in Bonn at 53 Bonn, Kurt Schumacher Str. 1, tel. 02221-223939, Telex 8-86402 (Respi), and he will then arrange a meeting between the witness and a duly empowered investigation attorney.

"Please inform us of any action taken by the Committee on the basis of this information."

19. An acknowledgement was sent to the Research Group.

20. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, the text of the cable given above was transmitted to the Government of Austria on 20 June as a follow-up to the note already addressed to that Government on 23 May 1975.

21. A reply dated 20 June 1975 (to the note sent on 23 May 1975) was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In the interest of a continued close co-operation with the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), the Federal Government of Austria declares its readiness in principle to hear the testimony proposed by the Committee. Such a testimony would have to be made before those Austrian authorities carrying out the investigations into the 'RISCO' case.

"However, the Federal Government of Austria would appreciate receiving, before further steps are taken, more precise data about the proposed witness and, in particular, his name."

22. Letters addressed to the Chairman were received from the Director-General for External Relations of the Commission of the European Communities and from the Assistant General Secretary of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Letter dated 8 July 1975 from the Director-General for External Relations of the Commission of the European Communities

"Thank you for your letter under reference concerning the possible granting of financial aid from the Commission for an iron and steel research project in which one of the participants would be a Southern Rhodesian body.

"You refer in particular to a letter from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions dated 26 February 1975.

"I have the honour to inform you that, as is indicated in the reply sent to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, a copy of which is enclosed, the research in question will be carried out in France jointly by Société Saulnes et Uckange and the Institut de Recherches de la Sidérurgie Française. Therefore, there is in fact no relationship between this project and the question of Southern Rhodesia."

"Enclosure

"Letter addressed to ICFTU by the President of the Commission of the European Communities

"Thank you for your letter of 26 February 1975 regarding the press report on the approval given by an ECSC Technical Research Committee for an investigation involving the participation of Rhodesia through its membership of the International Pig Iron Secretariat. This approval, I should add, related solely to the technical merit of the proposal due to the considerable interest in the study within the Community.

"I would like to stress that the concern you have expressed about the possible involvement of Rhodesia in this research has, from the outset, been shared by the Commission. We have always felt that it would not be acceptable for the Commission to support the project when it involved co-operation with this régime.

"Due to the importance of the project in relation to the specific needs of the Community's steel industry, however, we still believe the work needs to be carried out. The Commission has taken the necessary steps, therefore, to change the contractor for this proposed research, which, if finally approved, will now be undertaken in France jointly by Société Saulnes et Uckange and the Institut de Recherches de la Sidérurgie Française. As a result of this change that we have made, I can assure you that Rhodesia would in no way be involved in the programme.

(ii) Letter dated 9 July 1975 from the Assistant General Secretary of ICFTU

"With reference to your letter of 21 May, ^{c/} we should like to point out

^{c/} Refers to the acknowledgement sent to that organization, as indicated in para. 5 of this case.

that our organisation has maintained close vigilance as far as the application of United Nations sanctions and decisions regarding Rhodesia is concerned. Whenever violation of such sanctions and decisions has come to light, we have alerted affiliates in the countries concerned, so that appropriate action could be taken.

"As an example of our most recent action, we are sending you enclosed a copy of our letter addressed to the European Communities and their reply thereto.

"Particular emphasis has also been put on the discouragement of white emigration to Rhodesia. Attached is a copy of a circular in this connection and of our letter to the British Prime Minister." p/

23. First reminders were sent to Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland on 18 July 1975.

24. By a note dated 24 July 1975, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee's secretariat that, pursuant to the Committee's request at the 236th meeting, his Government's efforts had yielded the following as the most likely address of the International Pig Iron Secretariat, an organization said to comprise 14 companies from different countries: 4 Düsseldorf 1, Breite Strasse 69, Federal Republic of Germany.

25. Acknowledgements were received from Austria (1 August) and the Federal Republic of Germany (11 August 1975).

26. A second reminder was sent to Switzerland on 25 August 1975.

27. A reply dated 28 August 1975 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Re participation of VOEST in imports of steel from South Africa or Southern Rhodesia respectively"

"On the basis of the investigation material provided by the Bermudan police and the statements of the President of the European-American Finance (Bermuda), Ltd. (EAF), Mr. Klaus Jacobs, VOEST-Alpine A.G., was interrogated about its alleged participation in steel imports from South Africa or Southern Rhodesia respectively. As a result of these interrogations, it has been established that VOEST has never carried out such imports.

p/ Matters relating to immigration are dealt with under the general subject "Immigration, tourism and sporting activities involving Southern Rhodesia" (see chap. I, paras. 5 and 7 (c), and chap. VI, "Immigration and tourism", above).

"Re guarantee for a credit in the amount of \$US 5.5 million given by VOEST to European-American Finance (Bermuda), Ltd. (EAF)"

"VOEST-Alpine A.G. does not in any way contest that it assumed the guarantee for a credit of \$US 5.5 million by European-American Finance (Bermuda), Ltd. (EAF).

"As already stated in the Permanent Representative's note No. 1146-A/75 of 2 April 1975 this credit was destined for the payment of steel mill equipment of VOEST to the South African firm SAEPIC, but not for the purpose of assuring payments of imports of semi-finished products from South Africa or Southern Rhodesia respectively.

"Re participation of Creditanstalt-Bankverein in a credit granted by the European-American (Bermuda), Ltd., (EAF) in the amount of \$US 5.5 million to the Swiss firm FEMETCO"

"Creditanstalt-Bankverein confirms to have participated - as a partner of the European-American Banking Corporation (EABC) as well as of the European-American Bank and Trust Company (EABTC) - in a credit of \$US 5.5 million by EAF TO FEMETCO with a share of \$US 2.75 million.

"Considering the fact that this credit had been fully (up to \$US 5.5 million) guaranteed by VOEST, Creditanstalt-Bankverein did not investigate into the purposes for which such credit was requested. Since VOEST had guaranteed the credit, it could, however, be assumed that this credit was connected with export transactions planned by VOEST.

"Finally, the Acting Permanent Representative of Austria would like to point out that the investigation material of the Bermudan police as presented - apart from the incorrect allegations as to participation by VOEST in steel imports from South Africa or Southern Rhodesia respectively - contains no clues for the establishment of hitherto unknown facts about a participation of VOEST and Creditanstalt-Bankverein in the business case in question."

28. Further to paragraph 24 above, and in accordance with the Committee's decision indicated in paragraph 15 above, the proposed letter was sent to the International Pig Iron Secretariat on 4 September 1975. The text of that letter is reproduced below:

"On instructions of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to bring to your attention certain information received by the Committee recently concerning the possibility of participation by the Rhodesia Iron and Steel Company (RISCO), through its membership of the International Pig Iron Secretariat, in a joint research project. According to that information the European Coal and Steel Community Technical Research Committee had approved a grant of about £20,000 towards a research project

that would be undertaken jointly by RISCO, the British Pig Iron Group and their counterparts in Finland, France, Italy, Norway and Sweden. Subsequent representations at different levels resulted in cancellation of the research contract to that group and its award, instead, to another consortium that excluded RISCO.

"Nevertheless the Committee felt that it should address itself to the International Secretariat with regard to RISCO membership in that organization. The Committee considers that such membership might be exploited to enhance the position of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and that participation of RISCO, or any other organ of the régime, in such international economic activity is, in any case, contrary to the Security Council sanctions against that régime;

"The Committee expressed great disappointment at the information that RISCO continued to be a member of the International Pig Iron Group. It therefore decided to request from the Group comments on the circumstances of that membership, as well as information on the measures contemplated by the constituent members of the organization to ensure the expulsion of RISCO therefrom.

"The Committee also indicated its desire to receive, at the earliest convenience, if possible within two months, the organization's comments on this matter."

29. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 4 September was sent to the Research Group, transmitting the text of the note of 20 June 1975 from Austria (see para. 21 above), and again requesting the name of the Austrian witness, as well as any other relevant information on the matter, so that the Committee might communicate it to the Austrian authorities.

30. Also on 4 September 1975, a letter was sent to ICFTU, expressing the Committee's appreciation for that organization's intervention with the Commission of European Communities in connexion with the reported research project involving participation by RISCO.

31. Similarly, a letter of the same date was sent to the Director-General for External Relations of the Commission of European Communities, expressing the Committee's appreciation for the measures undertaken by the Commission to ensure non-participation of RISCO in the research project, and expressing the Committee's hope that the Commission would continue to exercise the utmost vigilance to enforce strictly Security Council mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

32. Further to paragraph 29 above, a cable dated 16 September 1975 was received from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, transmitting the name of the individual in question with a request that the information be kept confidential.

33. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, the text of the cable from the Research Group was transmitted to Austria on 14 October 1975.

34. An acknowledgement dated 16 October 1975 was received from Austria.

35. A reply dated 31 October 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The intensive investigations conducted by the competent German authorities have not yet brought to light any further findings. However, the investigations are being continued in various locations. The Federal Government would be grateful to learn from the Security Council Committee ... if it has any further information that could be of help to the German authorities in their investigations."

36. A letter dated 3 November 1975 (also partly covering Case No. INGO-7) was received from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, Bonn. The relevant portion of the letter is reproduced below.

"You may be interested to learn that, so far, no attempt has been made by the Austrian Government to establish contact with our witness for Case No. 171."

37. An acknowledgement was sent to the authors of the communication in paragraph 36 above.

38. In the absence of a reply from Switzerland, the Committee included that Government in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

39. A reply dated 13 November, which crossed with a third reminder sent to that Government on 14 November 1975, was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Federal authorities have taken note with interest of the documents concerning the inquiries carried out in Bermuda regarding the possible participation of European American Finance (Bermuda), Ltd., in the RISCO case. They are continuing to give careful attention to this case and are pursuing their investigations within the legal means available to them. They will not fail to communicate as soon as possible to the Secretary-General the eventual outcome of their detailed inquiry into this case."

40. A further cable dated 24 November 1975 was received from the Research Group, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"We wish to inform the Committee on sanctions that the Austrian authorities still have not contacted us in order to secure the testimony of the witness named by us in our telex of 16 September 1975.

"Since Wednesday, 19 November 1975, we are receiving information from Vienna about an extensive cover-up operation being organized within VOEST. Potential witnesses are being threatened with immediate dismissal should they

offer their testimony. At the same time, documentary evidence of VOEST's involvement in the RISCO case is being withdrawn from archives and registers,

"We therefore have reason to suspect a breach of confidence. As you will recall, in our telex of 16 September 1975, we provided the witness' name, with an explicit request that his identity be protected. It goes without saying that we expected the witness to be heard by the Austrian authorities carrying out the investigation into the RISCO case before the management of VOEST is advised of the testimony.

"We wish to inform the Committee that we are closely observing the present cover-up operation within VOEST. We shall not hesitate to publicize the details in due course."

41. As in paragraph 37 above, an acknowledgement was sent to the authors of the cable.

42. Further to paragraph 35 above, a reply dated 24 November 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has solicited the opinions of experts in the matter whose names were given in the list attached to the Secretary-General's aforementioned note of 27 March 1975. The British experts, the Geo-Chemical Division of the Institute of Geological Sciences in London, came to the conclusion

'that it is not possible nowadays to ascertain by means of chemical analysis (including modern instrumental methods) the country of origin of steel blooms and billets. Modern steel technology is designed to eliminate all unwanted inclusions in the production of a uniform composition.'

This confirms the opinion of the Technical Laboratories of the German customs authorities (Zolltechnische Prüfungsanstalt) in Cologne.

"On being presented with the documents attached to the Secretary-General's note of 13 May 1975 and other material ascertained during the investigations, the German representatives involved in the case repeated their former statements that no one from their companies had taken part in the talks in Vienna on 8 August 1972 and in Paris on 18 August 1972. It was not possible to prove the contrary either on the basis of travel expense reports or as a result of an examination of the register of the Bristol Hotel in Paris by French customs officers. The representatives of the German companies maintained that the only subject of their talks with their South African counterparts had been imports of South African steel and that the idea of possible supplies from Southern Rhodesia would have been rejected from the outset. They insisted that it was wrong that Femetco had been established on the initiative of Klöckner and Co. Femetco had, in fact, been brought in by the South African side.

"According to the present state of the investigations, the German companies involved cannot be charged with maintaining unlawful economic relations with Southern Rhodesia, nor with having any knowledge of such business relations.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would be pleased if the Security Council Committee continued to assist it in its investigations and is prepared, on its part, to continue fully to co-operate with the Committee."

(200) Case No. 176. New Zealand insurance companies: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 246th meeting, a note dated 12 September 1975 was sent to New Zealand, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"At its 246th meeting, the Committee examined the reply dated 22 October 1974 from the Government of New Zealand and expressed its appreciation for the information it contained.

"In its efforts to obtain as much information as possible towards the implementation of its duties, the Committee wonders whether the Government of New Zealand could provide it with further details concerning in particular the relationship between the New Zealand companies involved and their subsidiaries in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee indicated that it would appreciate receiving the information requested above, together with any additional comments or details which might be relevant to the case, at the earliest convenience of His Excellency's Government and if possible within one month."

4. A reply dated 30 October 1975 was received from New Zealand, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of New Zealand to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note of 12 September seeking additional information on the relationships between the New Zealand Insurance Company, Limited, and the New Zealand Insurance Company (S.A.), Limited, and the New Zealand-based South British Insurance Company Limited and the firm of the same name reported to be operating in Southern Rhodesia.

"The New Zealand authorities have ascertained that the New Zealand Insurance Company (S.A.), Limited is a subsidiary of the New Zealand-based firm entitled The New Zealand Insurance Company, Limited, and that the other firm

reported to be operating in Southern Rhodesia, the South British Insurance Company, Limited, is a separate company from, although under the control of, the New Zealand-based firm of the same name. Enquiries have been made with the New Zealand Registrar of Companies as to the nature of the relationship between the companies, but it appears that no information could be found in New Zealand's company records to shed further light on the question. The New Zealand authorities have however suggested that information concerning the relationships might be obtainable from the Southern Rhodesian register of companies. The New Zealand authorities will, in the meantime, continue their research into the question, and any further information on the subject will be forwarded to the Secretary-General."

(201) Case No. 203. Payment by Southern Rhodesian bank to Austrian company:
United Kingdom note dated 7 March 1975

1. By a note dated 7 March 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning a payment said to have been made by a Southern Rhodesian bank to an Austrian company. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that an Austrian company is trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that early in January 1975 a payment of approximately 72,000 Austrian schillings was made by a Southern Rhodesian bank, possibly through intermediary banking channels, to the Creditanstalt Bankverein, Vienna, for credit to the Austrian company, Simmering-Graz-Pauker, AG, Vienna. The payment was made by order of a Southern Rhodesian company, Miner Metals (PTY), Ltd., and was in settlement or part settlement of Simmering-Graz-Pauker's invoice No. 10602 of 10 December 1974 to the Southern Rhodesian concern.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Austria to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Simmering-Graz-Pauker has been trading with Southern Rhodesia."

2. In accordance with the Committee's standard practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 20 March 1975 was sent to Austria, transmitting the United Kingdom note and inviting the Government's comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 9 April 1975 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Simmering-Graz-Pauker AG, does not contest that they did receive, in January 1975, via the Creditanstalt Bankverein, a payment in the amount of 71,900 Austrian schillings from the South African firm Miner Metals (PTY), Ltd., Johannesburg. The transaction in question concerned the supply of hard steel

plates to the above-mentioned firm, for which Simmering-Graz-Pauker billed the said firm by invoice No. 10602 the amount of 71,900 Austrian schillings. Delivery was made, as is shown on the invoice, c.i.f. Port Elizabeth.

"The transmittal of the said amount to Creditanstalt Bankverein for credit to Simmering-Graz-Pauker, AG, was made by order of the South African firm Miner Metals (PTY), Ltd., Johannesburg, through the Swiss Discount Bank (Overseas), Ltd., Geneva.

"The relevant documents, which were readily submitted by Simmering-Graz-Pauker, AG, to the competent Austrian authorities did not contain any indication, from which one could conclude that the client has been a Southern Rhodesian firm or that payment was made through a Southern Rhodesian bank."

4. By a note dated 6 June 1975, the expert consultant informed the Committee that the company, Miner Metals (PTY), Ltd., had been reported by the United Kingdom as Southern Rhodesian, but that the Austrian Government, in reply to the Committee concerning the firm in question, indicated that it was South African. The company was not listed in Beerman's Financial Yearbook of South Africa (1973), vol. 1 or 2 or under companies on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange or under the alphabetical index of South African companies. Nor was it listed in the Cape Transvaal Printers, Ltd., Directory of South Africa 1973 or in the section of that directory covering Southern Rhodesia. The representative of the United Kingdom delegation on the Committee had been contacted on 1 May 1975 for any clarification he might be able to give on the matter. On 14 May 1975, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the expert consultant that according to information just received from South African sources, there apparently was no address of Miner Metals (PTY), Ltd., listed in the register. The only address available was that of the company's secretary, which was given as:

Irish, Smithers and Co., (accountants)
1301 Edura Building
40 Commissioner Street
P.O. Box 9616
Johannesburg
South Africa

(202) Case No. 208. Financial loan to a Southern Rhodesian Company: United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1975

1. By a note dated 13 May 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning arrangements by a bank in Luxembourg to finance wholly or partly a loan to a Southern Rhodesian company. The text of the note reads as follows:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a Luxembourg bank has been involved in the financing of a loan to a Southern Rhodesian concern.

"The information is to the effect that the Commerzbank International of Luxembourg was responsible for either wholly or partly financing a loan, equivalent to DM 10.5 million, to a Southern Rhodesian company, Rhodesian Alloys, Ltd., which has already drawn the total loan mainly in DM but partly in Swiss francs and United States dollars.

"The information also indicates that the loan is to be repaid in three equal instalments and that the first instalment of DM 3.5 million fell due for payment on 14 March 1975. The information further indicates that in order to disguise the fact that the loan was made to a Southern Rhodesian concern, all matters relating to the servicing of the loan are handled by a South African company, Union Acceptances, Ltd., of Marshall Town, Johannesburg.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that the Commerzbank International may have financed, wholly or in part, a loan of the equivalent of DM 10.5 million to Rhodesian Alloys, Ltd."

2. In accordance with the Committee's standard practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 20 May 1975 was sent to Luxembourg, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 2 June 1975 was received from Luxembourg, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"According to that note, a bank established in Luxembourg, namely the Commerzbank International, has participated in the financing of a loan granted to a Southern Rhodesian enterprise. The Commerzbank International of Luxembourg apparently undertook the total or partial financing of this loan, amounting to the equivalent of 10.5 million DM, to a Southern Rhodesian company, Rhodesian Alloys, Ltd., which has already taken out the entire loan, largely in deutsche mark but also in Swiss francs and United States dollars.

"Wishing to co-operate fully with the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), the competent Luxembourg authorities initiated an in-depth inquiry in order to shed full light on this matter. As a result of the inquiry, carried out by the Commissariat luxembourgeois aux Banques, it was found that neither the administrative documents consulted nor the bank's records show any sign of the Commerzbank International of Luxembourg having carried out the operation in question."

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 250th meeting, notes dated 22 October 1975 were sent to the Federal Republic of Germany and to Luxembourg under the no-objection procedure. The substantive parts of those notes are reproduced below:

(i) Note to the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Committee is currently engaged in inquiries into a loan to a Southern Rhodesian company reported by the United Kingdom to have been financed by the Commerzbank International of Luxembourg. A copy of the relevant United Kingdom note is herewith enclosed for ease of reference. The Committee has already requested the Government of Luxembourg to undertake the necessary investigations to determine if, and in what circumstances, such a loan might have been made available to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

"Meanwhile, the Committee has received information that the Luxembourg bank is a subsidiary of the Commerzbank established in the Federal Republic of Germany. Accordingly, the Committee decided, at its 250th meeting, to request His Excellency's Government to undertake the necessary investigations which might help to determine whether or not the parent bank was aware of, or took part in, the reported loan transaction.

"The Committee also expressed the hope that it might receive a reply from His Excellency's Government at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

(ii) Note to Luxembourg

"At its 250th meeting the Committee considered His Excellency's reply of 2 June 1975 concerning the above-mentioned case of a financial loan reported to have been made to a Southern Rhodesian company by the Commerzbank International of Luxembourg. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the reply thus received and for the Government's co-operation in assisting in its inquiries into the matter.

"The Committee considers this case as particularly serious because it deals with possible financing of industrial development in Southern Rhodesia, a matter about which the Committee has repeatedly expressed its concern. It therefore felt that further investigations could be usefully conducted by the Luxembourg authorities with a view to ascertaining more conclusively that the transaction in question was never conducted by the bank. In particular the Committee would welcome information that the investigating authorities received assurance from the bank that not only did it not take part in, but also had no knowledge of, the financing of the reported loan to the Southern Rhodesian company.

"The Committee expressed the hope that it might be able to receive a reply from His Excellency's Government at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

5. An acknowledgement dated 30 October 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

N. TOURISM AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

(203) Case No. 143. Southern Rhodesian representational offices abroad: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information received since the submission of that report is given below.

(a) Rhodesia National Tourist Board: Basel, Switzerland

3. There is no new information concerning this matter in addition to that contained in the sixth report.

(b) Rhodesian information centre and Air Rhodesia office: Sydney, Australia

4. There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(c) Rhodesia information office: Washington, D.C., United States of America, and Rhodesia National Tourist and Air Rhodesia offices, New York, New York, United States of America

5. There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(d) Rhodesia information office: Paris, France

6. For original information concerning this matter, see Case No. INGO-12 in annex V to the present report.

(204) Case No. 190. Tourism agencies and Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Replies were received from the Netherlands, Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 5 February 1975 from the Netherlands

"Acting on the note of the Secretary-General, the Netherlands authorities contacted the management of Royal Dutch Airlines, N.V. (KLM), which gave information to the effect that a representative of KLM had indeed attended a

conference of the Association of South Africa Travel Agents held in Southern Rhodesia during September 1974. The KLM management, furthermore, confirmed that the manager of its affiliate in South Africa had given permission to send one of its representatives to the conference in question. According to the management of KLM, the attendance of a representative at the conference was related only to the interests of the company in South Africa and not to commercial activities in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Netherlands authorities pointed out to KLM that they considered the presence of a representative of the company at the conference, which was attended by a great many Southern Rhodesian authorities with a view to promoting tourism in Southern Rhodesia, a violation, if not of the letter of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), then at least of the spirit of the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia."

(ii) Note dated 12 February 1975 from Sweden

"The case in question has been forwarded to the Chief Public Prosecutor for investigation. The result of the investigation will be communicated at the time when he has taken the decision either to prosecute or to dismiss the case. For the time being it cannot be stated when the Prosecutor in the District of Stockholm, who has been assigned to the investigation, will be in the position to take such a decision.

"Meanwhile, it should be noted that the Scandinavian Airline System, a joint venture of Swedish, Danish and Norwegian companies, has assured that it has neither participated in the conference in question nor authorized anyone to participate in it. In this context, it may be recalled that SAS was one of the first international airlines to cancel its previously existing interline agreement with Air Rhodesia in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia."

(iii) Note dated 10 February 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Association of South African Travel Agents is a South African organization which, like other associations of its kind, holds annual conferences alternatively in its own and in neighbouring countries. A representative of Lufthansa, the airlines of the Federal Republic of Germany in South Africa, attended the conference, because it was imperative for him for business reasons to use the opportunity of such meetings to speak to the leading travel agents and their senior executives in South Africa. His attendance did not, however, involve any travel or financial arrangements that might have violated the sanctions imposed by the Security Council on Southern Rhodesia. Moreover, Lufthansa has no intention of encouraging tourism to Southern Rhodesia. Therefore, it has terminated the interline agreement with Air Rhodesia, effective 31 December 1974."

(iv) Note dated 20 March 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The news in the article published by the Chronicle, according to which Mr. Hans Junges, president of the German Travel Agents' Association, had been attending the annual conference of the Association of South African Travel Agents in Rhodesia, is incorrect.

"The German Travel Agents' Association (Deutscher Reisebüroverband) does not take part in the meetings of other organizations of its kind, either in Europe or in other parts of the world. Questions of general interest to the trade are being dealt with by the Universal Federation of Travel Agents' Associations. The German association only attends the meetings of this latter organization."

4. First reminders were sent to Brazil, Israel and South Africa on 15 April 1975.
5. A reply dated 7 May 1975 was received from Israel, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Government of Israel regrets the attendance of a representative of El Al at the annual conference of the Association of South Africa travel agents held in Southern Rhodesia during September 1974. El Al and companies of this nature in other countries do not always act in accordance with specific directives of the Government. It is our understanding that representatives of airline companies from other States which are implementing the sanctions stipulated in Security Council resolution 253 (1968) were also present at that conference. The Israeli authorities have drawn appropriate conclusions from the above occurrence and an effort will be made to prevent the repetition of such cases in the future."

6. Second reminders were sent to Brazil and South Africa on 29 May 1975.
7. Replies were received from Sweden and Brazil, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 21 August 1975 from Sweden

"The investigation by the Chief Prosecutor has now been concluded. The information obtained shows that a Norwegian citizen, representative of the Scandinavian Airlines System (a joint venture of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish interests) attended the yearly meeting of South African Travel Agents, which took place in Southern Rhodesia in September 1974. It was reported that the site of these conferences, which is decided by the above-mentioned organization, in which SAS is not represented, changes from year to year - in 1975 it will take place in Mauritius. The conference was an ordinary conference of its kind, with some 300 participants from international travel organizations and air companies, and the SAS representative himself deemed it a matter of routine to participate.

"It has also been reported that the transport from South Africa to Southern Rhodesia was arranged by the Association of South African Travel Agents and free of charge for the participants. The same association had also arranged hotels. The costs were paid by the participants in South African rands in Johannesburg.

"The Chief Public Prosecutor has seen no reason to question the aforementioned information obtained from SAS. It is the view of the competent authorities that there is no reason to believe that anyone within the SAS administration in Sweden has been implicated in violation of any of the rules concerning sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Chief Public Prosecutor therefore has ruled that there are no reasons to initiate prejudicial inquiry."

(ii) Note dated 8 September 1975 from Brazil

"With reference to your note of 28 August 1975, I have the honour to inform you that no representatives of Brazilian tourist organizations or airlines attended the annual conference of the Association of South African Travel Agents held in Southern Rhodesia in September 1974.

"The Brazilian Government regrets the delay with which this information is transmitted to Your Excellency. The delay was caused by the need to proceed to a careful investigation in order to ascertain all facts pertinent to this case, and consequently should not be interpreted as reflecting any lack of interest on the part of the Brazilian Government relative to the decisions of the Security Council Committee. I would further, in this context, mention the fact that resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council was incorporated into Brazilian law through the enactment of Decree 62.980 of 12 July 1968."

8. In the absence of a reply from South Africa, the Committee included that Government in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

(205) Case No. 194. Holiday Inns and car rentals: information obtained from published sources

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report, but for information on the general subject of franchises and trade names in Southern Rhodesia, see the Committee's special report to the Security Council (S/11913).

(206) Case No. 200. Publication of tourist guide to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In December 1974 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a 66-page booklet entitled Reiseführer Rhodesien had been

published in Berlin and Munich, the Federal Republic of Germany, as a result of which it was claimed that tourism to Southern Rhodesia had been given a boost in Austria and in the Federal Republic of Germany.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 30 January 1975 were sent to Austria and the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitting copies of the source of the information. The notes also expressed the Committee's concern that, should the information prove well-founded, actions contrary to the provisions of mandatory resolutions of the Security Council might follow; the Committee had therefore decided to bring that information to the attention of the Governments, in the hope that the Governments would take a most serious view of any such actions.

3. An acknowledgement dated 5 February 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

4. A reply dated 19 March 1975 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Special Committee for the supervision of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia established by the Federal Government has examined the 'Reiseführer Rhodesien', published by Polyglott and found that it refers also to the sanctions imposed by the Security Council. In that regard, the brochure might unwittingly even contribute to making the sanctions known to the German public.

"As the freedom of speech and information is granted by the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Federal Government is in no position to suppress the publication of the brochure."

5. An acknowledgement dated 2 April 1975 was received from Austria.

(207) Case No. 213. Flights to and from Southern Rhodesia: case opened at the 243rd meeting

1. The original information concerning this case is contained in the report submitted to the Committee by the secretariat on 5 June 1975, during the Committee's consideration of the question of interline agreements with Air Rhodesia. The report indicated that Malawi, Portugal and South Africa had direct air-links with Southern Rhodesia, whereby services existed between them and Southern Rhodesia, operated either by Air Rhodesia, or by both Air Rhodesia and their airline companies. The airline companies involved were given as Air Malawi, Ltd. (Malawi), DETA and TAP (Portugal) and South African Airways (South Africa) (see para. 9 of Case No. INGO-4 in annex V to the present report).

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 243rd meeting, a case was opened on the matter and notes dated 28 July 1975 were sent to Malawi, Portugal and South Africa, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of the note is reproduced below:

"The Committee examined again recently the question of interline agreements with Air Rhodesia and deplored that no reply had as yet been received from His Excellency's Government to the Secretary-General's note dated 13 May 1974 despite a reminder dated 27 June 1975 (case INGO-4).

"Meanwhile, in addition to the possibility of interline agreements, the attention of the Committee has been brought to the information that _____ had direct air services with Southern Rhodesia.

"Once again, the Committee would like to recall that in paragraph 6 of resolution 253 (1968), the Security Council decided that 'all States Members of the United Nations shall prevent airline companies constituted in their territories and aircraft of their registration or under charter to their nationals from operating to or from Southern Rhodesia and from linking up with any airline company constituted or aircraft registered in Southern Rhodesia'.

"The Committee takes the view that such an air-link would be a clear violation of that provision.

"The Committee would be grateful if His Excellency's Government would investigate the matter urgently and take all necessary action to ensure the full implementation of the sanctions established by the Security Council against the illegal régime.

"The Committee would welcome in particular the texts of legislation or administrative orders relevant to the implementation of paragraph 6 of resolution 253 (1968), together with any comments His Excellency's Government may wish to make, on the whole question of direct or indirect airlinks with Southern Rhodesia, at its earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

3. First reminders were sent to Malawi, Portugal and South Africa on 7 October 1975.

4. In the absence of replies from Malawi, Portugal and South Africa, the Committee included those Governments in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

(208) Case No. 227. Organized tours abroad for persons using Southern Rhodesian passports: information obtained from published sources

1. At its 253rd meeting the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania drew the Committee's attention to information obtained from published sources, according to which advertisements had appeared in a Southern Rhodesian newspaper offering tours abroad for persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia. The advertisements indicated that tours could be arranged to Greece, Portugal and Switzerland for 22 days at a cost of \$R 650. The tour organizers, Thomas Cook, gave assurance that Southern Rhodesian passports were acceptable.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at that meeting, a note dated 18 November 1975 was sent to Greece, Portugal and Switzerland, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of the note is reproduced below.

"The Committee has received information from published sources, according to which advertisements have appeared in a Southern Rhodesian newspaper offering tours abroad for persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia. The advertisements indicate that tours of certain European countries including _____ are available for 22 days at a cost of \$R 650. The tour organizers, Thomas Cook, also give assurance that Southern Rhodesian passports will be accepted, presumably by the receiving countries.

"At its 253rd meeting, the Committee decided that the above information should be brought to the attention of His Excellency's Government for urgent necessary action. Should the information be correct, the Committee wished to point out that the admission of persons holding Southern Rhodesian passports would certainly be in violation of the Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in that Territory. The Committee also considers that the admission of any other persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia is contrary to the spirit and intent of those provisions. In this connexion the Committee felt it necessary to recall in particular the provisions of paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"Consequently, the Committee expressed the hope that His Excellency's Government might exercise the greatest vigilance to ensure the complete implementation of the relevant Security Council provisions. In the event that such persons might have been already admitted into _____, the Committee would appreciate receiving from the Government, at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month, information as to the circumstances in which entry by such persons was permitted."

3. Also, in accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a letter dated 11 December 1975 was sent to the manager of Thomas Cook, at the international headquarters address of that organization in London. The text of that letter is reproduced below.

"I have been instructed by the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) to address this letter to you in connexion with advertisements for tourist travel abroad, under the auspices of Thomas Cook, Pearl Assurance House, First Street, Salisbury, that have recently appeared in a Southern Rhodesian newspaper. According to the advertisements, offers are made to persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia for a 22-day tour of the European countries of Greece, Portugal, and Switzerland at a cost of \$R 650. The tour organizers, Thomas Cook, also give assurances that Southern Rhodesian passports will be accepted, presumably by the receiving countries.

"Should the information be correct, the Committee wishes to point out that the admission of persons holding Southern Rhodesian passports would certainly be in violation of the Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in that Territory. The Committee also considers that the admission of any other persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia is contrary to the spirit and intent of those provisions. Consequently, the Committee has already contacted the Governments concerned, requesting them to undertake any necessary measures and to exercise the greatest vigilance to ensure the complete implementation of the relevant Security Council provisions.

"Meanwhile, the Committee has also decided to address itself to your establishment, which is the international headquarters of Thomas Cook, with a request for a clarification of the basis upon which the Southern Rhodesian passports have been declared acceptable for travel abroad by the Thomas Cook agency in Southern Rhodesia. The Committee would also like to know whether that agency has received confirmed assurances from its correspondent agencies in the countries concerned that Southern Rhodesian passports would be accepted as valid travel documents by the respective countries, or whether some other arrangements to circumvent the sanctions provisions were to be used."

O. OTHER CASES

- (209) Case No. 133. Supply of medical equipment to the University of Southern Rhodesia: Swedish note dated 7 June 1972

See annex IV.

- (210) Case No. 154. "Tango Romeo" - Sanctions-breaking activities via Gabon: information obtained from published sources and supplied by the United Kingdom on 30 August 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 214th meeting, as indicated in the seventh report, the proposed notes were sent to Gabon, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece and the Netherlands on 16 December 1974, under the no-objection procedure.
4. A note dated 30 December 1974 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations ... with reference to his note of 28 December 1973, concerning movements by aircraft owned by persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia and having operated within the Netherlands, a copy of which is herewith attached, (see para. 3 (ii) of (179) Case No. 154 in the seventh report as indicated above) has the honour to inform him as follows.

"In the aforesaid note the name 'Herab' was mentioned which should have been 'Herat'. The names of the places indicated in the note are final destinations which are reached either directly or through transshipment. Since Affretair, as far as known, does not execute flights to Afghanistan, and Afghanistan authorities are unaware of any activities of Affretair in their country, the Netherlands Government supposes that in the matter in question transshipment might have taken place."

5. In the absence of a reply from Malawi, Portugal, South Africa, Sudan, Zaire and Zambia, the Committee included those Governments in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
6. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114, above.
7. At the 236th meeting on 8 May, the representative of the United States submitted the text of a statement issued on 3 March 1975 by the United States Department of Commerce, and previously communicated to the Committee by him at the 229th meeting on 13 March 1975. The text of the statement is reproduced below:

"An indefinite denial of all US export privileges has been issued against Compagnie Gabonaise d'Affretement Aerien (Affretair) of Libreville, Gabon, the US Department of Commerce announced today. This action followed the issuance in October 1974 of a 60-day temporary denial order against the firm.

"Evidence that Affretair falsely represented to officials of the US Government that a Douglas DC-8-55F Jet Trader aircraft would not be utilized in any traffic with Southern Rhodesia or in any manner contrary to the United Nations sanctions against that Territory was the basis of the initial denial action and the continuing investigation by the Department's Compliance Division.

"As a part of the investigation, relevant and material interrogatories and a request for documents were duly served on the Director of the respondent company. No response has been received and the period provided for its submission has passed. Good cause for this failure has not been shown.

"Pursuant to section 388.15 of the Export Administration Regulations, the respondent has been indefinitely denied all US export privileges for failure to respond to interrogatories and a request for documents, without good cause having been shown. Restoration of privileges will be considered only after a proper response or a showing of good cause for refusal to respond has been provided. The issues presented by evidence of substantive violations of the Export Administration Regulations which gave rise to the temporary denial order will, however, remain to be resolved.

"All outstanding validated licences in which Affretair has an interest have been cancelled. The US Export Administration Regulations provide that, without authorization from the US Department of Commerce, no person may trade with a party who has been denied US export privileges in commodities exported from the United States."

8. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the same meeting, notes dated 13 May 1975 were sent to Gabon and the Netherlands. The text of the note to Gabon, which was adopted by the Committee at that meeting, is reproduced below:

"The Secretary-General of the United Nations ... has the honour to inform him, at the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, that the Committee has considered His Excellency's note of 23 August about the operations of Compagnie Gabonaise d'Affrètements Aériens (Affretair).

"The Committee has viewed with concern the fact that, as was reported to the Government of Gabon in the Secretary-General's note of 16 December 1974, and according to a new statement issued on 3 March 1975 by the United States Department of Commerce, the United States Government has found it necessary to suspend the export privileges of Affretair because of

allegations that Affretair falsely represented to officials of the United States Government that a Douglas DC-8-55F Jet Trader aircraft would not be used in any traffic with Southern Rhodesia. This action, together with the action of the Gabonese authorities and that of the Government of Greece, which has prohibited the landing of Affretair aircraft in Greek territory, seems to appear to confirm the suspicions expressed within the Committee with regard not only to Affretair but also to Air Trans Africa.

"The Committee therefore warmly welcomed the action of the Gabonese authorities in bringing Affretair under real and continuing control by making it subject to Gabonese legislation. The Committee assumes that the operations of Affretair which are contrary to Security Council resolution 253 (1968) will accordingly be definitively terminated.

"The Committee would be grateful for an assurance that action similar to the action taken with respect to Affretair will be taken or has been taken with respect to Air Trans Africa. The Committee would also be grateful for an assurance that the Gabonese authorities will take effective measures to ensure that aircraft owned by either company will not fly into or out of Southern Rhodesia and that no financial or economic resources will be made available or remitted to persons or bodies within Southern Rhodesia as a result of the operations of either or both of these airlines.

"The Committee would moreover be grateful if the Gabonese authorities would inform the Committee, as soon as possible, preferably within one month:

- (a) Of the present ownership of both Affretair and Air Trans Africa;
- (b) Of the complete list of the countries they cover, giving the names of airports of arrival and departure.

"The Committee looks forward to being kept regularly informed of the situation in accordance with the undertaking in His Excellency's note. When the information sought by the Committee is made available, the Committee wishes to include it in the Committee's annual report to the Security Council."

The note to the Netherlands requested information on how it had been possible for the aircraft Tango Romeo to be repaired and to leave Schiphol Airport, and through what channels Affretair had paid for the services it had received at that airport. The note took account of the fact that the Netherlands was not being singled out, since the Committee was aware that the aircraft also landed at airports in other countries.

9. With regard to the activities of Bureau Veritas, a private company in France authorized to certify the airworthiness of aircraft registered in Gabon, the representative of France informed the Committee at the same meeting that the

reasons why his Government was dissociated from the actions of Bureau Veritas had been clearly stated in the seventh report (see para. 28 (i) of (179) Case No. 154 in the seventh report as indicated above). He would, however, transmit to his Government the wish expressed by members of the Committee that the questionable activities of that company operating on French soil be restrained.

10. Further to paragraph 5 above, the Committee again included Malawi, Portugal, South Africa, Sudan, Zaire and Zambia in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.

11. A reply dated 18 July 1975 was received from Sudan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan to the United Nations ... wishes to convey that the competent Sudanese authorities categorically refuted allegations regarding Case No. 154. Airline Affretair No. TR-LQR had neither landed at Sudan's airports nor passed through the Sudan air space.

"The Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan wishes to reiterate once again Sudan's unflinching support and commitment to sanctions against the racist and illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia."

12. A first reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 21 July 1975.

13. An acknowledgement dated 29 July 1975 was received from the Netherlands.

14. A reply dated 11 August 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In consequence of the Secretary-General's request of 5 June 1974 the competent authorities in the Netherlands have been requested to conduct an extensive inquiry into the activities of the Affretair plane TR-LQR at Schiphol Airport, with the following result.

"Director of Affretair is Mr. J. M. Mallock, BP 484, Libreville, in Gabon. Fuel has been purveyed to the plane by Mobil Oil. Further inquiries concerning the latter question can be obtained at the office of Mobil Oil in Brussels.

"In the course of the inquiry by the Netherlands authorities no unlawful act could be established.

"The Netherlands authorities are of the opinion that documents that have been disclosed for the purpose of proving certain facts cannot be copied or conveyed to third parties without prior knowledge of the party concerned as long as there is no reasonable base for the suspicion that an unlawful act has been committed. The Netherlands Government therefore regrets that it cannot comply with the Secretary-General's request to this effect."

15. Further to paragraph 10 above, a note dated 19 August 1975 was received from the Government of the Sudan, with reference to its previous note dated 18 July 1975. The substantive part of the note reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan wishes to submit to the attention of the Secretary-General a copy of the Southern Rhodesia Boycott Act, issued by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan in 1966 q/ which reflects the adherence of the Sudan to the United Nations Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

16. Further to paragraph 9 above, the Committee again included Malawi, Portugal, South Africa, Zaire and Zambia in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

(211) Case No. 155. Cameras from Switzerland: United Kingdom note dated 27 September 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 239th meeting, the standard terminal note was sent to Switzerland on 16 June 1975.
4. A reply dated 10 July 1975 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to his note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1), Case No. 155, of 16 June 1975, which indicates that the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia has decided to record in its permanent documents the fact that to date it has not received sufficient information to enable it to take a final decision on this case.

"The Permanent Observer has the honour to recall that he indicated in his note of 24 June 1974 that on the basis of the investigation conducted pursuant to the initial information transmitted by the Secretary-General, it had not been possible to conclude that the firm of Wild was implicated in an illegal transaction. However the Swiss authorities stated that they were prepared to pursue the matter if the Committee provided them with further information corroborating the charges made by the Committee concerning this Swiss firm."

q/ For the text of the Act, see the reply dated 27 May 1970 from the Sudan, reproduced in Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fifth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1970, document S/9853, annex II.

(212) Case No. 158. Pine oil from the United States - "Charlotte Lykes":
United Kingdom note dated 19 October 1973

There is no new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the seventh report.

(213) Case No. 159. Cardboard containers from Spain: United Kingdom note
dated 12 November 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Spain, the Committee again included that Government in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.
4. A reply dated 16 June 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Owing to the vagueness of the information provided by the Government of the United Kingdom in its note of 12 November 1973, the competent Spanish authorities have been able to find no evidence that the alleged export transaction occurred. In any event, the Spanish Government, in compliance with the relevant Security Council resolutions, has not granted and is not granting any licences for exports to Southern Rhodesia.

"Furthermore, for the purpose of granting export licences, the Spanish Ministry of Trade requires a certificate of final destination for goods to be exported to South Africa and, in the case of goods destined for countries or territories bordering on Southern Rhodesia, a clause stipulating that they shall not be re-exported."

(214) Case No. 201. Danish trade with Southern Rhodesia: information submitted
by Denmark

See annex IV.

(215) Case No. 210. Supply of various items of miscellaneous equipment to
Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1975

1. By a note dated 24 June 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning attempts by a Southern Rhodesian company to obtain various items of miscellaneous equipment from certain Israeli firms. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a number of Israeli companies are trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that a Southern Rhodesian company, Central African Machinery and Spares (Pvt), Ltd., of Salisbury has ordered, or is interested in ordering, various items of miscellaneous equipment, including lamps, water bottles, jerricans and canvas, on a substantial scale from a number of Israeli companies. The companies involved are:

- I. Inavia, Ltd., Tel Aviv;
- II. American Near East Corp (Israel), Ltd., Tel Aviv;
- III. Aida Israel Foreign Trade Co., Ltd., Tel Aviv.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Israel in order to assist them in their investigation into the possibility that the three Israeli companies listed are supplying goods to Southern Rhodesia."

2. In accordance with the Committee's standard practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 3 July 1975 was sent to Israel, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 9 July 1975 was received from Israel, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"After the necessary investigations had been carried out, no confirmation of the allegations made in the said note of the United Kingdom was obtained."

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 22 October 1975 was sent to Israel, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee considered the reply from His Excellency's Government dated 9 July 1975 relating to the Committee's inquiries into the possibility that various items of miscellaneous equipment were being supplied to Southern Rhodesia by the following Israeli companies: Inavia Ltd., Tel Aviv; American Near East Corp. (Israel) Ltd., Tel Aviv; and Aida Israel Foreign Trade Co., Ltd., Tel Aviv.

"While expressing its appreciation for the reply thus received, the Committee considered that to fulfill its mandate as established by the Security Council, it would be necessary for it to receive additional information on the means used by the authorities in reaching the conclusion that no confirmation of the allegation that the three Israeli firms cited above were supplying goods to Southern Rhodesia was obtained. Therefore, the Committee asked the Secretary-General to request the Israeli Government to pursue the matter further and to transmit to the Committee any additional information which may come to light, together with copies of the documentation on the basis of which the investigating authorities have established their findings.

"The Committee also indicated that it would appreciate receiving a reply at the earliest convenience from His Excellency's Government, if possible within one month."

(216) Case No. 214. Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by Switzerland

See annex IV.

(217) Case No. 218. Southern Rhodesia and the International Chamber of Commerce Congress: information obtained from published sources

1. In June 1975 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which 10 Southern Rhodesian businessmen had travelled to Spain and attended the International Chamber of Commerce congress, which was held there during that month.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 214th meeting, a note dated 6 August 1975 was sent to Spain, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has received information from published sources that 10 Southern Rhodesian businessmen attended an annual International Chamber of Commerce Congress which opened in Madrid on 16 June 1975. A copy of the newspaper report is attached for ease of reference.

"If this report is correct, the Committee believes that the participation of Southern Rhodesian businessmen in this international meeting could be exploited to enhance the position of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. Such a development would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council. Furthermore, the Committee considers that in such circumstances the admission into the territory of a State Member of the United Nations of particular persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia is in conflict with the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"The Committee has expressed its disappointment at the information contained in the press report and indicated its desire to receive at the earliest convenience, if possible within two months, any comments His Excellency's Government might wish to make on this matter, together with the names and a description of the travel documents of the Southern Rhodesian participants."

3. A first reminder was sent to Spain on 7 October 1975.

4. A reply dated 25 October 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform /him/ that, on completion of the necessary investigations by the Spanish authorities, the Secretary-General of the Official Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Madrid transmitted to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs the following explanations provided by the Secretary-General of the International Chamber of Commerce, Paris, which organized the Congress:

1. The Southern Rhodesian businessmen who participated in the fifteenth Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce at Madrid did so in a strictly personal capacity. There is no National Committee (National Section) of the ICC in Southern Rhodesia, and therefore, no one from that country can be a member of the Council or other executive organs of the ICC or of the International Technical Commissions.

2. The ICC is an association which neither pursues nor promotes any profit-making aims. The sole purpose of its congresses is to enable its members to discuss general problems of international trade. Within the framework of the Congress, therefore, no commercial transactions can be engaged in.

"However, since these explanations are not entirely satisfactory within the context of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the Spanish authorities will take all necessary measures to ensure that this type of incident does not recur in the future."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 9 December 1975 was sent to Spain, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has examined His Excellency's reply of 25 October 1975, concerning the case referred to above and has expressed its appreciation for the Government's co-operation in the matter.

"The Committee has indicated that it shares the Government's observation as to the inadequacy of the explanations concerning the participation of Southern Rhodesians in an international conference abroad, whether attending

in a personal or representational capacity. In this connexion it wishes to recall its position on the matter, namely, that the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia is contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council resolutions establishing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee, therefore, while welcoming the Government's assurance to take all the necessary measures to ensure against the recurrence of such incidents in the future, has expressed the hope that it might yet be informed of the circumstances in which such persons were admitted into Spain. In particular, it would be interested to know their names and the nature of the travel documents used by them.

"The Committee has also indicated that it would appreciate receiving the Government's comments on the matter at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

) Case No. 233. Supply of chemical substances to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 1 December 1975

By a note dated 1 December 1975, the United Kingdom reported information concerning the supply of chemical substances to Southern Rhodesia. The text of note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information, of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation, that an Israeli company is trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that an Israeli concern, Narex Middle East Co Ltd. of Tel Aviv, had supplied, and continues to supply, large quantities of chemical substances to a Southern Rhodesian company, African Explosives and Chemical Industries (Rhodesia) Ltd. of Salisbury. It is likely that some of these substances, which include polyvinyl chloride ipethene and caustic soda, are used by the Rhodesian company in the manufacture of ammunition.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Israel in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that the Narex Middle East company of Tel Aviv is engaged in the supply of chemicals to Southern Rhodesia."

In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection edure, a note dated 10 December was sent to Israel, transmitting the United dom note and requesting comments thereon.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
