

019037E



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

ORDC

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR
SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT No. 2

v. II part 15

Volume II

UNITED NATIONS

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

VOLUME II

ANNEXES

	<u>Page</u>
III. Import of chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia into the United States of America	1
IV. Cases of transactions conducted with the consent or knowledge of reporting Governments	32
V. Cases opened from information supplied by individuals and non-governmental organizations	40
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)	89
VII. Note and statistical data prepared by the Secretariat on Southern Rhodesian trade for 1974	92
Appendix I. Imports of all commodities from Southern Rhodesia . . .	124
Appendix II. Exports of all commodities to Southern Rhodesia	127
Appendix III. (a) External trade of South Africa (Customs Union) - Tobacco	129
(b) External trade of Mozambique - Tobacco	130
(c) External trade of Angola - Tobacco	131
Appendix IV. (a) External trade of South Africa (Customs Union) - Asbestos	132
(b) External trade of Mozambique - Asbestos	134
Appendix V. (a) External trade of South Africa (Customs Union) - Chrome ore	135
(b) External trade of Mozambique - Chrome ore	136

Annex III

IMPORT OF CHROME, NICKEL AND OTHER MATERIALS FROM SOUTHERN
RHODESIA INTO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A. SPECIFIC CASES

(32) Case No. 130. Chrome ore - "Agios Georgios": information submitted by Somalia on 27 March 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 in annex II.

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

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

B. QUARTERLY REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE
BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1. Previous information concerning this matter is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the matter since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A letter dated 17 March 1975 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee was received from the representative of the United States, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In conformity with the statement made by the United States representative on 22 March 1972 at the Committee's 68th meeting, I am submitting for the information of the Committee a report on shipments of strategic materials that have been imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 October 1974 to 31 December 1974. Attached please find a list of these imports." a/

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, the letter from the representative of the United States and its attachment were issued as a press release on 8 April 1975, and notes of inquiry were sent to the

a/ The lists referred to in this and subsequent communications from the United States are contained in the pages following para. 8 of this section.

Governments of the registry of the ships concerned, except the United States, b/ as indicated in the relevant individual cases in section C below.

The text of the press release is reproduced below.

"By a report dated 17 March 1975 the Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations submitted to the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia a list of shipments of chrome ore, nickel and other materials that were imported in violation of the Security Council resolution 253 (1968) into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 October 1974 to 31 December 1974.

"After examining that report, the Committee expressed once again its deep concern at this continued violation by the United States Government of the sanctions provisions, especially paragraph 3 (a) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), by its continuous importation of chrome ore, nickel and other materials from the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia; and it appealed to the United States Government to take the appropriate and necessary measures and actions to terminate this flagrant violation.

"The Committee also decided to ask the Secretary-General to request the Governments of the countries of registration of the ships concerned other than the United States, to investigate the circumstances in which cargoes of Southern Rhodesian origin, the carriage of which is also prohibited by paragraph 3 (c), of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), were carried on their vessels.

"Furthermore, recalling that paragraph 18 of the first special report of the Committee (S/10632), c/ which was approved by Security Council resolution 318 (1972), stated, inter alia, that as part of the need to keep the international community regularly informed the Committee should consider the issuance of press releases covering its work and matters of topical interest, the Committee decided to make the matter public.

"Accordingly, the text of the United States report, which includes the quantities involved, is reproduced below:

"In conformity with the statement made by the United States representative on 22 March 1972 at the Committee's sixty-eighth meeting, I am submitting for the information of the Committee a report on shipments of strategic materials that have been imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 October 1974 to 31 December 1974. Attached please find a list of these imports."

b/ See S/11178/Rev.1, annex II, sect. B, paras. 9 and 10.

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

5. A letter dated 16 July 1975 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee was received from the representative of the United States, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In conformity with the statement made by the United States representative on 22 March 1972 at the Committee's 68th meeting, I am submitting for the information of the Committee a report on shipments of strategic materials that have been imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 January to 30 June 1975. Attached please find a list of these imports."

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, the letter from the representative of the United States and its attachments were issued as a press release on 19 August 1975, and notes of inquiry were sent to the Governments of the registry of the ships concerned, except the United States, as indicated in the relevant, individual cases in section C below. The text of the press release is similar to that reproduced in paragraph 4, above.

7. A letter dated 14 November 1975 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee was received from the representative of the United States, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In conformity with the statement made by the United States representative on 22 March 1972 at the Committee's 68th meeting, I am submitting for the information of the Committee a report on shipments of strategic materials that have been imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 July to 30 September 1975. Attached please find a list of these imports."

8. At the time of preparation of the present report, the letter from the representative of the United States was still under consideration by the Committee.

UNITED STATES IMPORTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

From 1 October through 31 December 1974

Commodity	Quantity (in short tons)	Port of embarkation	Port of importation	Estimated date of arrival	Vessel	Country of registry
High-carbon ferrochrome	331	Lourenço Marques	Baltimore, MD	10/1/74	Austral Pilot	US
Asbestos fibre	65	Durban	Charleston, SC	10/6/74	Hellenic Sun	Greek
Chrysotile asbestos fibre	75	Lourenço Marques	Charleston, SC	10/7/74	Hellenic Sun	Greek
Chrome ore	13 392	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, LA	10/28/74	Mohawk	US
Chrome ore	1 898	Beira	New Orleans, LA	10/28/74	Mohawk	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	1 660	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	11/2/74	Potomac	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	220	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	11/2/74	Potomac	US
Ferrochrome silicon	1 628	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	11/3/74	Potomac	US
Low-carbon ferrochrome	1 665	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	11/3/74	Potomac	US
Chrome ore	10 733	Beira	New Orleans, LA	11/4/74	Potomac	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	368	Durban	New York, NY	11/12/74	New England Trapper	Liberia
High-carbon ferrochrome	3 926	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, LA	11/22/74	American Oriole	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	1 004	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	11/22/74	American Oriole	US
Chrome ore	3 926	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, LA	11/22/74	American Oriole	US
Chrome ore	4 409	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	12/2/74	American Oriole	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	35	Johannesburg	Brooklyn, NY	12/8/74	New England Trapper	Liberia
Chrome ore	16 888	Beira	Charleston, SC	12/30/74	Ogden Sacramento	Panama

UNITED STATES IMPORTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

From 1 January to 30 June 1975

Commodity	Quantity (in short tons)	Port of embarkation	Port of importation	Estimated date of arrival	Vessel	Country of registry
Low-carbon ferrochrome	1 104	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	1/1/75	Yellowstone	US
Ferrochrome silicon	1 711	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	1/1/75	Yellowstone	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	3 686	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, IA	1/1/75	Yellowstone	US
Chrome ore	3 896	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, IA	1/4/75	Yellowstone	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	543	Port Elizabeth, South Africa	Baltimore, MD	1/10/75	Austral Pilot	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	20	Durban, SA	Seattle, WA	2/5/75	Nedlloyd Kingston	Netherlands
Chrysotile asbestos fibres	134	Durban, SA	New York, NY and Charleston, SC	2/6/75	Austral Pilgrim	US
Asbestos fibre	24	Durban, SA	Charleston, SC	2/12/75	Austral Pilgrim	US
Asbestos fibre	32	Durban, SA	Charleston, SC	3/5/75	African Sun	US
Chrysotile asbestos fibres	103	Durban, SA	Charleston, SC	3/6/75	African Sun	US
Ferrochrome silicon	1 378	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	4/1/75	Columbia	US
Low-carbon ferrochrome	1 680	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	4/1/75	Columbia	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	4 496	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	4/1/75	Columbia	US
Chrysotile asbestos fibres	231	Lourenço Marques	Charleston, SC	4/8/75	Austral Patriot	US
Chrome ore	4 354	Beira	New Orleans, IA	4/29/75	Columbia	US
Ferrochrome	11 023	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, IA	4/29/75	Columbia	US
Low-carbon ferrochrome	1 378	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	4/30/75	Columbia	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	545	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	5/20/75	Austral Pilgrim	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	2 341	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	5/20/75	Mohawk	US
Low-carbon ferrochrome	1 102	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	5/20/75	Mohawk	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	551	Lourenço Marques	Baltimore, MD	5/26/75	Ascendant	Panama
Chrome ore	12 160	Lourenço Marques	Charleston, SC	6/13/75	Sarina-E-Rehmet	Pakistan
Chrome ore	7 716	Beira	New Orleans, IA	6/15/75	Yellowstone	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	8 564	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, IA	6/15/75	Yellowstone	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	1 662	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, IA	6/15/75	Mohawk	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	2 605	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, IA	6/16/75	Mohawk	US

UNITED STATES IMPORTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

From 1 July to 30 September 1975

Commodity	Quantity (in short tons)	Port of embarkation	Port of importation	Estimated date of arrival	Vessel	Country of registry
Chrysotile asbestos fibres	362	Durban	Charleston, SC	7/1/75	Austral Pilot	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	543	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	7/4/75	Austral Pilot	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	41	Durban	Baltimore, MD	7/4/75	Sealand Resource	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	143	Durban	Baltimore, MD	7/12/75	Sealand Market	US
Chrysotile asbestos fibres	66	Port Elizabeth	Charleston, SC	7/16/75	Austral Pilot	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	82	Durban	Baltimore, MD	8/1/75	Sealand Market	US
Chrome ore	16 325	Lourenço Marques	Charleston, SC	8/2/75	Ogden Missouri	Panama
High-carbon ferrochrome	11 024	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, LA	8/11/75	Platte	Panama
Chrysotile asbestos fibres	212	Port Elizabeth	New York, NY Philadelphia, PA	8/18/75	Austral Pilot	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	250	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, LA	8/18/75	Great Faith	Panama
High-carbon ferrochrome	1 045	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, LA	8/18/75	Great Faith	Panama
Chrome ore and concentrates	6 074*	Lourenço Marques	Charleston, SC	8/25/75	Great Faith	Panama
Asbestos fibre	119	Port Elizabeth	Philadelphia, PA	8/26/75	Austral Pilot	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	55	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	9/9/75	Mormacglen	US
Crude chrysotile asbestos fibre	73	Port Elizabeth	Charleston, SC	9/11/75	Austral Patriot	US
Asbestos fibre	103	Port Elizabeth	Norfolk, VA	9/19/75	African Meteor	US
High-carbon ferrochrome	545	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	9/30/75	African Comet	US

* Exact tonnage being verified. If there is any change, an amended report will be submitted.

C. CASES OPENED FROM INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY THE UNITED STATES IN ITS QUARTERLY REPORTS TO THE COMMITTEE

Case No. USI-1. Ferrochrome silicon - "La Chacra": United States quarterly report dated 11 October 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. At the 246th meeting on 28 August 1975, the Committee considered a number of cases opened from the United States quarterly lists, namely: Case Nos. USI-1, USI-2, USI-3, USI-7, USI-8, USI-14, USI-16 and USI-27. In those cases, the Committee noted that there were discrepancies between the information submitted by the United States and the replies sent by Governments to the Committee's inquiries regarding the involvement of those Governments' registered shipping companies in the transportation of chrome, nickel and other materials to the United States. In particular, those Governments had consistently stated that, according to documents submitted by the shipping companies, the merchandise transported to the United States had not originated in Southern Rhodesia.
4. At that meeting, the Committee decided to request the United States Government to consider the possibility of instructing importing United States companies to advise Governments of the registry of the ships to be used, as well as the shipping companies themselves, that the merchandise to be transported to the United States was actually of Southern Rhodesian origin. The Committee also decided that since the situation had arisen in several cases and could arise in others in the future, the matter would be considered as one of the topics on its list of general subjects.

Case No. USI-2. Ferro-silicon-chromium - "Treutenfels": United States quarterly report dated 9 January 1973

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 and 4 of Case No. USI-1 above.

Case No. USI-3. High-carbon ferro-chromium - "Bris": United States quarterly report dated 10 July 1972

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 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, above.

Case No. USI-4. Nickel cathodes, asbestos fibre, ferro-silicon chromium and high-carbon ferrochrome - "African Sun", "Moormacove", "Mooracargo", "African Moon", "African Lightning", "Moormacbay", "African Mercury", "African Dawn" and "Moormactrade": United States quarterly reports dated 10 July and 11 October 1972 and 9 January 1973

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

Case No. USI-5. Nickel cathodes and ferrochrome - "Hellenic Leader", "North Highness", "Venthisikimi" and "Ocean Pegasus": United States quarterly reports dated 10 July and 11 October 1972 and 9 January 1973

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 in annex II.
3. Also, a reply dated 4 December 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 advise that according to information just received from the Greek authorities, although all defendants involved in Case No. USI-5 (SS VENTHISIKIMI) were acquitted by the Court of Piraeus, the Disciplinary Board of the Greek Merchant Marine by its act No. A251/DK 15797 decided to take against the captain of the said vessel, Mr. Nicholas Tavlaridis, the disciplinary measure of six-month suspension of his licence.

"This Permanent Mission has the honour to request the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

Case No. USI-6. High-carbon ferrochrome - "S.A. Huguenot" and "Nederburg": United States quarterly reports dated 11 October 1972 and 9 January 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 South Africa, 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.

Case No. USI-7. High-carbon ferrochrome - "Angelo Scinicariello" and "Alfredo Primo": United States quarterly reports dated 11 October 1972 and 9 January 1973

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 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, above.

Case No. USI-8. Nickel cathodes - "Marne Lloyd", "Musi Lloyd" and "Merwe Lloyd": United States quarterly reports dated 10 July and 11 October 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, see paragraphs 3 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, above.

Case No. USI-9. Low-carbon ferrochrome, ferrochrome silicon - "Aktion", "Pholegandros", "Mexican Gulf" and "Trade Carrier": United States quarterly reports dated 11 October 1972 and 9 January 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 and seventh quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 13 March and 10 July 1975, respectively.
4. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, above.
5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

Case No. USI-10. Ferrochrome - "Trade Carrier": United States quarterly report dated 9 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, which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

Case No. USI-11. Nickel cathodes - "Hellenic Destiny": United States quarterly report dated 9 April 1973

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 in annex II.

Case No. USI-12. High-carbon ferrochrome - "Costas Frangos": United States quarterly report dated 9 April 1973

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 in annex II.

Case No. USI-13. High-carbon ferrochrome, chrome ore and ferro-silicon chrome - "Adelfoi": United States quarterly report dated 9 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, which were issued as press releases on 13 March, 10 July and 4 November 1975, respectively.

Case No. USI-14. Low-carbon ferrochrome and high-carbon ferrochrome - "Costas Frangos" and "Nortrans Unity", respectively: United States quarterly report dated 2 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 1 April 1975 (also covering Case Nos. USI-16, USI-22 and USI-27) was received from Canada, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's notes of

14 March 1975 (Case No. USI-27)
11 December 1974 (Case No. USI-14)
1 October 1974 (Case No. USI-14)
8 August 1974 (Case No. USI-22)

1 July 1974 (Case No. USI-16)
6 June 1974 (Case No. USI-22) and
12 February 1974 (Case No. USI-14)

and to his notes of 14 August and 9 October 1974, d/ concerning allegations of violations of sanctions against Rhodesia by Dundas Shipping Company of Montreal. In his note of 9 October 1974, the Permanent Representative advised the Secretary-General that a full investigation on these alleged violations was in progress in Canada. 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. Although information provided by the Government of the United States to the sanctions Committee suggested that the cargoes in question were of Rhodesian origin, the Canadian Government has not been successful in obtaining substantive evidence to demonstrate that this was, in fact, the case. Dundas Shipping has certificates of origin (albeit suspect) asserting that the cargoes are of South African origin. The Canadian Government has no means to prove before a court of law that the certificates of origin are false; nor has it found it possible to obtain evidence to prove that, in contracting for the shipments, the company had any knowledge of the commodity to be carried or of its country of origin.

"The Canadian Government has over a period of many months been in contact with the appropriate United States authorities and has attempted both formally and informally through diplomatic and police channels to obtain evidence which would be of value in a court of law. Pursuant to its request, it has received from the United States authorities only: (a) an affidavit from the United States Treasury dated 25 June 1974, and (b) a letter from the United States Customs Service received by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police liaison officer in Washington, D.C. on 6 November 1974, regarding the discharge of Rhodesian chrome from the MV Nortrans Unity at New Orleans in March 1973. (Copies of these reports are attached.) These documents did not materially assist the investigation, as they consisted of the same information which originally prompted the sanctions Committee's inquiries. They do not constitute evidence to establish a violation of Canadian law. For that purpose, it is essential to obtain uncontrovertible evidence that Dundas Shipping, in contracting for the shipments, learned from the clearing house, L. J. Buck, of New Jersey that the commodities to be transported were of Rhodesian origin.

d/ See S/11594/Rev.1, annex III, Case No. USI-14, paras. 9 (i) and 11, respectively.

"A copy of a summary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police investigation of this case is enclosed for the information of the sanctions Committee. While the Canadian Government is not, at this point, able to proceed further on this case, it would be prepared to carry on if the sanctions Committee could assist it in obtaining evidence which would overcome the forementioned obstacles.

Summary of documentary evidence submitted by the
Government of Canada

Summary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police investigations

This case came to our attention in a copy of a letter dated 15 January 1973 from Mr. R. A. Bull, External Affairs to Mr. G. M. Schuthe of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

The letter reported the arrival of the shipment of 550 tons of Rhodesian ferrochrome silicon in Detroit on 13 September 1972 via the British-owned ship, La Chacra. The letter concluded that if the charterers, Dundas Shipping and Trading Co., Ltd., Montreal, had knowingly arranged for the shipment, then they would have violated section 6 of the Canadian-Rhodesian Regulations.

On 26 January 1973, Mr. C. Varkaris of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce advised that his office would take the necessary corrective action. Nothing more was heard until the following year.

On 10 July 1974, Mr. Dennis Evans of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce advised by letter that during the past two years Dundas Shipping and Trading Co., Ltd., had been cited by the United Nations sanctions Committee on four different occasions for involvement with shipment of Rhodesian goods from Mozambique to the United States.

In the first case, Industry, Trade and Commerce had investigated and found no mens rea. In the second case, Industry, Trade and Commerce requested Dundas to supply them with documentation of the transaction, but they received only a copy of the ship's charter. In the latter two alleged violations, no approach was made to Dundas. Industry, Trade and Commerce requested the RCMP to investigate instead.

Our investigator, Sgt. G. E. Woodley, "A" Division GIS, met with Mr. W. P. Molson of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and received all information relevant to the case. Mr. Molson had asked External Affairs to obtain documentation of the origin of the goods from the United States Government. However, External Affairs had received no documentation of value in a Canadian court of law.

The following is a summary of the four shipments in sequence under the name of each ship:

- LA CHACRA: (Norwegian registry) Ferro-silicon chrome delivered to the United States port of Detroit, Mich., in September 1972. This shipment was loaded in Lourenço Marques, Mozambique, and was documented as South African chrome. The lading bills and certificate of origin showed that the goods originated in South Africa. There is no way of proving that Dundas "knowingly" violated the United Nations Rhodesia regulations. There are no sanctions against goods shipped from or to South Africa by United Nations member countries.
- NORTRANS UNITY: (Greek registry) High-carbon ferrochrome delivered to the United States port of New Orleans, La., March 1973. This shipment was also loaded at Lourenço Marques and reportedly documented as South African chrome. After leaving Lourenço Marques, the Nortrans Unity called at Durban, South Africa, and loaded high-carbon ferro-manganese. No evidence is available to show that Dundas "knowingly" committed an offence.
- SUN RIVER: (Norwegian registry) Low-carbon ferrochrome discharged at the United States port of New Orleans, 15 September 1973. High-carbon ferro-chrome discharged at the United States port of Burnside, La., 16/17 September 1973. This information was received from the United Nations with the origin of the chrome reported to be Southern Rhodesia. No further information or documentation available in Canada.
- STEINFELS: (Federal Republic of Germany registry) High-carbon ferrochrome delivered to the United States port of New Orleans, 18 July 1973. This information was received from the United Nations with the origin of the chrome reported to be Southern Rhodesia. No further information or documentation available in Canada.

The certificate of origin is considered an important document in business circles and would likely be considered as an important piece of defence evidence by the courts. In reality, it is rather useless, as it is issued by the Board of Trade for a small fee and contains only information provided by the person requesting it. The Board of Trade makes no investigation as to the truthfulness of the information. The certificates for these shipments would be issued in Mozambique.

When the La Chacra incident was first reported, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce had samples of Southern Rhodesian chrome and South African chrome analysed by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

The result was that there was virtually no difference in the metals. This eliminates the possibility of identification of country of origin.

On 12 August 1974, we instituted inquiries through our Washington Liaison Office to obtain the names of receivers of the goods and to establish whether or not the United States Government directly or indirectly authorized these shipments. No immediate response was received. This was predictable, because at that time the question of importation of Rhodesian chrome was before Congress. Washington Liaison Office supplied current press clippings showing that the United States openly imports Rhodesian chrome as provided for by the Byrd amendment.

On 4 September 1974 the United Nations reported two more shipments to External Affairs as follows:

WILDENFELS: (Federal Republic of Germany registry) High-carbon ferrochrome (974T) discharged at Burnside, La., United States, on 2 October 1973.

STEINFELS: (Federal Republic of Germany registry) High-carbon ferrochrome (325T) discharged at Burnside, La., United States, on 13 December 1973. This is the second time this ship has been used.

Mr. John Licharson, African Affairs I Division, External Affairs, assisted by contacting Washington. He learned that the firm of Leonard J. Buck in New York also had something to do with the charters. He also learned that it appeared the United States was no longer importing chrome from anywhere. In fact, they were in the process of selling off part of their 900,000 ton stockpile.

On 23 October 1974 the investigator from Ottawa, accompanied by a member of our Montreal staff, visited Dundas Shipping and Trading Company, Ltd., offices in Montreal. They interviewed Mr. J. R. Findlay, who claimed he is now only president of Braemar Shipping and Trading Company. He advised he has not been actively associated with Dundas for approximately one-and-a-half years, except to act as an agent until such time as an office is opened in Montreal. Once this has been done he would cease to act for Dundas. He did not have complete details but stated that Dundas was now owned by a Mr. J. MacKenzie and a Mr. Wilson of England and a Mr. J. Peacock of Cherrywood, believed to be in southern Ontario. The chartering is arranged by L. J. Buck of New Jersey, United States, and MacKenzie in England, with Findlay acting as the Canadian agent, only when the ship is also carrying cargo for eventual delivery to Canada.

Although outwardly appearing to be very co-operative, Findlay was very evasive and in no way would he be pinned down to giving a straight answer. Even when asked questions in a very blunt manner, he continued to give half

answers or refer to one of the other files to indicate something irrelevant. We believe that he is cognizant of the fact that we are more or less clutching for straws and can do nothing without documentary proof. This also places in doubt the value of any port records obtained by our WLO, because we will be placed in the position of having to prove that he received them.

On 6 November 1974 we received a report from the United States Customs Service regarding the discharge of Rhodesian chrome from the MV Nortrans Unity at New Orleans in March, 1973. This report identifies the country of exportation as Rhodesia, with the following qualifying comments:

"This importation was made in accordance with the requirements of the Office of Foreign Assets Control concerning the importation of critical materials from Rhodesia. The information contained in this communication is for the official use of the Government of Canada and may not be further disclosed without the express prior authorization of Headquarters, U.S. Customs Service. Disclosure of this information to the United Nations by the Government of Canada would be considered by the U.S. Customs Service as an 'official use'."

4. Other documents enclosed with the note from Canada were analysed and summarized for the Committee by the expert consultant. Among them was a certificate dated 25 June 1974 from the Treasury Department, Washington, submitted to the Canadian Government, giving information to the effect that the high-carbon ferrochrome (1,679,481 lb) imported by Almet, Inc., Main Street, Bedminster, New Jersey, and shipped from Lourenço Marques aboard the vessel Nortrans Unity to Burnside (USA) (arrival date, 10 April 1973) was of Southern Rhodesian origin. The importation had been made in accordance with section 530-518 (c) of Rhodesian Sanctions Resolution 31 CFR Part 530.

5. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that the certificates of origin submitted by the Canadian Government to the Committee were obtained from Leonard J. Buck and Co., Inc., 299 Madison Avenue, Morristown, New Jersey, the importer, and by Braeman Shipping, Ltd., Steamship Agents and Chartering Broker, 1 Westmount Square, Montreal, Canada. Those certificates declared the merchandise in question to be of South African origin.

6. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of (63) Case No. 114 in annex II, as well as paragraphs 3 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, above.

Case No. USI-15. High-carbon ferrochrome - "Weltevreden": United States quarterly report dated 2 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. In the absence of a reply from South Africa 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.

Case No. USI-16. Ferrochrome - "Steinfels": United States quarterly report dated 9 October 1973

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 Case No. USI-14, as well as paragraphs 3 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, both above.

Case No. USI-17. Nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kingston": United States quarterly report dated 9 October 1973

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

Case No. USI-19. Nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kembla": United States quarterly report dated 25 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. A reply dated 27 December 1974 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In this connexion, the Netherlands Government wishes to point out that erroneous data were initially furnished by the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) which were corrected in the Secretary-General's note of 1 October 1974. Hence the surprise of the Netherlands Government that, as early as 4 November, the Security Council Committee insisted upon a reply to the note of 1 October. The fact that the Security Council Committee has seen fit to remind the Netherlands Government of the lists containing the names of Governments that have not responded within the prescribed period of two months has been disappointing to the Netherlands Government, inasmuch as there had already been conducted an investigation as a result of the erroneous note of 1 March 1974."

4. A second reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 27 February 1975.

5. A reply dated 19 March 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Netherlands authorities have not yet closed the inquiry in this matter. As soon as information concerning this case is received, it will be conveyed immediately."

6. A reply dated 10 June 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"From the inquiry that the Netherlands authorities have made into this matter, it appears that the MV Nedlloyd Kembla discharged on 27 January 1974 at Seattle (USA) a cargo of '18 boxes electrolytic nickel (41,992 lb)'. The date mentioned for the discharge in the communication of the Secretary-General as 1 February 1974 therefore appears to be incorrect. This cargo was offered for shipment at Durban and accepted by the agent of the said vessel. Neither the documents nor the bill of lading contain any indication concerning the possible Southern Rhodesian origin of this cargo."

7. In a statement to the Committee at the 253rd meeting on 30 October 1975 (also covering Case Nos. USI-26 and USI-33), the representative of the United States recalled that there had been differences between the statistics submitted to the Committee by the United States Government and those submitted by the Governments of Canada and Greece with respect to imports under the so-called Byrd amendment. The United States had agreed to clear up the matter with the embassies of the countries concerned and the United States Department of State.

The cases in question were Nos. USI-19, USI-26 and USI-33, which involved shipments of nickel cathodes. Communications were being sent 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. Such communications should be referred to: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

Case No. USI-20. Nickel cathodes - "Morganstar": United States quarterly report dated 25 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 South Africa, 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, respectively.

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

5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included South Africa in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

Case No. USI-21. Asbestos fibre, chrystoline asbestos fibre and ferrochrome - "Hellenic Destiny", "Ocean Pegasus", "Venthisikimi", "Costas Frangos" and "Nortrans Unity": United States quarterly report dated 25 January 1974

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 in annex II.

Case No. USI-22. Silicon, low- and high-carbon ferrochrome - "Sun River": United States quarterly report dated 25 January 1974

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

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case since the submission of that report, see paragraphs 3 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, above.

Case No. USI-24. High-carbon ferrochrome - "Wildenfels" and "Steinfels": United States quarterly report dated 25 January 1974

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

Case No. USI-25. Chrysotile asbestos - "Hellenic Destiny": United States quarterly report dated 9 May 1974

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 in annex II.

Case No. USI-26. Nickel cathodes - "Weser Express": United States quarterly report dated 9 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. A reply dated 10 January 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent authorities in the Federal Republic of Germany have no record of a vessel named Western Express.

"On the chance that this name represents a garbled version of the name Weser Express, the shipping documents of the Weser Express for the first quarter of 1974 were screened. This examination produced no evidence that nickel cathodes have been transported during the period in question."

4. At the 234th meeting on 24 April 1975 the representative of the United States made a statement to the Committee, the text of which is reproduced below.

"I am pleased to report further pursuant to Case No. USI-26, Nickel cathodes - Western Express. The vessel involved in the shipment reported by the United States Government has been verified to be indeed the Weser Express. This vessel, which we understand is under the registration of the Federal Republic of Germany, discharged 36 tons of Southern Rhodesian origin nickel cathodes in Norfolk, Virginia, 5 January 1974. The shipment originated in Rotterdam."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 14 May 1975 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitting the corrected information given by the representative of the United States and requesting further investigations into the carriage of the prohibited cargo in a vessel under the registration of the Federal Republic of Germany.

6. A reply dated 19 August 1975 was received from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Further investigations conducted in the meantime by the competent German authorities have disclosed that the vessel Weser Express did not call at the port of Norfolk, Virginia (USA) on 5 January 1974 but on 31 December 1973 and 25 January 1974. During none of these voyages the vessel had nickel cathodes aboard.

"Should any additional information be requested in this case, the Federal Government would appreciate it if more substantial evidence could be provided by the Security Council Committee."

7. At the 253rd meeting on 30 October 1975, the representative of the United States made a statement to the Committee, for the summary of which see paragraph 7 of Case No. USI-19, above.

Case No. USI-27. Ferrochrome silicon - "Stockenfels": United States quarterly report dated 9 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. A reply dated 19 December 1974 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The attention of the competent authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany had already been drawn to this case by press reports in May 1974. Thorough investigations have been conducted. It was established that the vessel Stockenfels loaded several lots from 31 December 1973 to 11 January 1974 in the port of Lourenço Marques and from 12-15 January in the port of Durban and discharged the cargo at Burnside from 4-11 February 1974. The examination of all documents relating to the shipment produced no evidence of Southern Rhodesian origin of the cargo. Moreover, in an annex to the charter parties of the German shipping company, the charterer, Dundas Shipping and Trading Co., Montreal, accepted an agreed clause stipulating that goods of Southern Rhodesian origin may not be carried. On instruction of the Federal Government, the German shipping company addressed the agents of the charterer and asked for clarification as to the origin of the cargo. The agents produced several certificates of origin issued by the competent authorities in Lourenço Marques certifying that the ferrochrome was of South African origin.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has furthermore conducted a thorough inquiry as to the circumstances in which such charter contracts are concluded. It will forward its findings as soon as possible.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would appreciate it, and it would considerably facilitate the investigations of the German authorities if, rather than merely being informed of an assertion that a German vessel had carried ferrochrome of Southern Rhodesian origin, it were furnished facts which indicate such origin.

"In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany it would be in keeping with the meaning and purpose of the sanctions if those who state they have knowledge of a cargo's Southern Rhodesian origin would inform the masters of the vessels or the shipping companies concerned accordingly in good time or at the earliest possible date. Freighters in particular should make sure that no charter parties are concluded which, seemingly against their better judgment, do not contain an assurance that cargo of Southern Rhodesian origin will not be carried."

4. A further reply dated 22 January 1975 was received from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, which reads as follows:

"Eight certificates of origin involving various minerals carried aboard the vessel Stockenfels in January/February 1974 are now available for perusal at this Mission."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 14 March 1975 was sent to Canada, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee is currently considering a case of violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, involving the shipment of a cargo of 1,005 tons of ferrochrome silicon reported by the United States to be of Southern Rhodesian origin discharged in the port of Burnside, Louisiana (USA) on 5 February 1974 by the vessel Stockenfels. This vessel is given by the United States as being under the registry of the Federal Republic of Germany.

"In the course of its inquiries into this case, the Committee has received information from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in a note dated 19 December 1974, that the vessel involved, though registered in the Federal Republic, was actually chartered by the shipping company to a Canadian company, Dundas Shipping and Trading Co., Ltd., Montreal. The note from the Federal Republic of Germany further stated:

"'in an annex to the charter parties of the German shipping company, the charterer, Dundas Shipping and Trading Co., Montreal, accepted an agreed clause stipulating that goods of Southern Rhodesian origin may not be carried.'

"Accordingly, the Committee has decided to invite the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter and to suggest that the circumstances in which a Canadian company permitted a vessel under the company's charter to engage in the transportation of a cargo of Southern Rhodesian origin, the carriage of which is prohibited by paragraph 3 (c) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), be investigated.

"The Committee has indicated that it would appreciate receiving a reply and any relevant information on the matter at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

6. A further reply dated 26 March 1975 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The German shipping lines active in southern Africa always have insisted that it is warranted either in their contracts with the charterer or in a supplementary document that no merchandise of Southern Rhodesian origin is being shipped. In doubtful cases the charterer is being asked to submit certificates of origin. A further investigation of the consignment in the port of lading by the master of the ship is not possible. The German shipping lines can therefore prove a violation of contract by the charterer only if they are provided with documents which are incontestable evidence that the shipped merchandise is of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"In order to clarify the question as to whether or not the merchandise shipped on board German vessels was of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Federal Government would recommend that the Sanctions Committee may, in the first place, conduct its investigations into the business relations of the importing firms. If these investigations produce evidence that the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia have in fact been violated, the Federal Government is in a position to take action against the shipping line."

7. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 203rd meeting, the expert consultant visited the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany and examined the documents mentioned in the reply of that Government dated 22 January 1975. The results of that examination were communicated to the Committee in a note by him dated 31 March 1975.

8. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that none of the certificates provided was among those required by the Committee as sufficient proof of origin, in accordance with the memoranda on the application of sanctions contained in the Secretary-General's notes dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 relating to documentary proof of origin transmitted to all States. The documents also showed that the cargoes carried aboard the ship had been shipped from Durban, South Africa, and Lourenço Marques, Mozambique, and were all given as being of South African origin. Moreover, the description and weight of the cargo supplied by the United States Government, i.e., 1,005 tons of ferro-chrome silicon, was not among those given in the Federal Republic documents. The attention of the Committee was also drawn to the last paragraph of the reply from the Federal Republic of Germany of 19 December 1974, reproduced in paragraph 3 above.

9. A reply dated 1 April 1975 was received from Canada, for the substantive part of which see paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Case No. USI-14, above.

10. At the 234th meeting on 24 April 1975, the representative of the United States of America made the following statement concerning the case:

"I should like to comment further on Case No. USI-27, Ferro-chrome silicon - Stockenfels. I should like to confirm that the Stockenfels, which we show to be a vessel registered in the Federal Republic of Germany, delivered either 1,005 or 1,108 tons of ferrochrome silicon to Burnside, Louisiana, 5 February 1974. The shipment originated in Lourenço Marques. The ferrochrome silicon in question was Southern Rhodesian."

11. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 3 and 4 of Case No. USI-1, above.

12. At the 253rd meeting on 30 October 1975, the representative of the United States made a statement to the Committee for the summary of which see paragraph 7 of Case No. USI-19, above.

Case No. USI-28. Nickel cathodes - "S.A. Huguenot": United States quarterly report dated 9 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. A first reminder was sent to South Africa on 19 March, a second reminder on 22 April and a third reminder on 6 October 1975.

Case No. USI-29. Asbestos fibre and chrysotile asbestos fibre - "Hellenic Laurel": United States quarterly report dated 6 September 1974

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 in annex II.

Case No. USI-30. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kimberley": United States quarterly report dated 6 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 24 December 1974 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"A thorough investigation conducted by the Netherlands authorities acting on the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) has led to the following conclusions. According to the bills of lading relating to the aforesaid shipment the vessel did indeed carry a consignment of nickel cathodes from Lourenço Marques to the port of Los Angeles during its voyage mentioned in the Secretary-General's note.

"The vessel did not, however, take a consignment of nickel cathodes to Seattle/Tacoma, although it did carry a shipment of nickel concentrate to that port. The bills of lading gave no indication that any of the above-mentioned consignments originated in Southern Rhodesia."

Case No. USI-31. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kembla": United States quarterly report dated 6 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 27 December 1974 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Acting upon the information by the Security Council Committee ... to the effect that the vessel Nedlloyd Kembla, which is registered by the Netherlands, discharged a cargo of nickel cathodes of Southern Rhodesian origin in the port of Seattle/Tacoma (USA), the Netherlands authorities conducted an investigation into this question.

"The investigation led to the conclusion that the vessel did not unload cathodes in the aforesaid port, but a shipment of 19,044 kg of electrolytic nickel was unloaded which had been shipped from the port of Durban.

"The shipping documents which were presented at the time of shipment contained no information that the cargo originated from Southern Rhodesia. The Acting Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Netherlands authorities have once again impressed upon the shipping company concerned, Koninklijke Nedlloyd, BV, to do its utmost within the boundaries of the possible to prevent transportation of goods destined for or originating from Southern Rhodesia."

Case No. USI-32. Chrysotile asbestos fibre - "Hellenic Carrier": United States quarterly report dated 6 September 1974

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 in annex II.

Case No. USI-33. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kyoto": United States quarterly report dated 14 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 10 June 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"From the inquiry made by the Netherlands authorities into this matter, it appeared that the MV Nedlloyd Kyoto discharged on 10 July 1974 at Los Angeles (USA) a cargo of '38 palletized boxes nickel cathodes (87,964 lb)'. The date of discharge, 6 July 1974, which was mentioned in the communication of the Secretary-General therefore appears to be in error. This cargo was accepted for shipment at the port of Lourenço Marques. Neither the documentation nor the bills of lading contained any indication concerning a possible Southern Rhodesian origin of this cargo."

4. At the 253rd meeting on 30 October 1975, the representative of the United States made a statement to the Committee, for the summary of which see paragraph 7 of Case No. USI-19, above.

Case No. USI-34. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Diana Skou": United States quarterly report dated 14 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 14 January 1975 was received from Denmark, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Investigation carried out by the Danish Foreign Ministry has shown the following:

"The Danish vessel MS Diana Skou, referred to in the Secretary-General's above-mentioned note, has been, and as per charter of 12 June 1973 still is, on time-charter with the South African shipping company South African Marine Corporation, Ltd., Cape Town.

"According to the charter party, the ship is only allowed to transport lawful merchandise.

"The Danish shipping company has, according to this charter party, no possibilities to control whether the South African shipping company in question complies with this special paragraph of the charter party.

"Considering the above given information, the Danish authorities have not found reasons to reproach the conduct in this case of the Danish shipping company Ove Skou.

"Furthermore, the company has given the information that MS Diana Skou was at sea on 7 August 1974 but was unloading in New Orleans on 8-9 August 1974.

"With reference to the request of the Security Council Committee ... to receive information on action taken and on any measures the Government of Denmark proposes to take in order to prevent participation by its nationals or by Denmark-registered vessels in such transactions, which are contrary to the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the Acting Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations has the honour to refer to the note of 9 October 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations to the Secretary-General. In that note, which was reproduced in United Nations document S/8853 of 15 October 1968, it is stated that in order to implement resolution 253 (1968), including its operative paragraph 3(c), the competent Danish authorities had issued a royal decree on measures against Southern Rhodesia of 18 September 1968, and that this royal decree had entered into force on 1 October 1968.

"The royal decree is still the foundation for the Danish implementation of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council against Southern Rhodesia."

Case No. USI-35. Asbestos fibre and chrysotile asbestos fibre - "Hellenic Sun":
United States quarterly report dated 17 March 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 17 March 1975, the United States informed the Committee that the above-mentioned vessel, given as being of Greek registration, was one of the vessels used to transport chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia to the United States during the period, 1 October to 31 December 1974.
2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 11 April 1975 was sent to Greece, requesting that the matter be investigated.
3. A first reminder was sent to Greece on 17 June 1975.
4. A reply dated 20 June 1975 was received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that on 19 May 1975 the Greek Ministry of Mercantile Marine instructed the Piraeus Port Authority to investigate the case of the vessel Hellenic Sun with all due speed and to forward it urgently to the competent public prosecutor."
5. A further reminder was sent to Greece on 4 August 1975, inquiring whether the investigation had been completed and the result could be communicated to the Committee.
6. In the absence of a reply from Greece, the Committee included that Government in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

Case No. USI-36. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "New England Trapper": United
States quarterly report dated 17 March 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 17 March 1975, the United States informed the Committee that the above-mentioned vessel, given as being of Liberian registration, was one of the vessels used to transport chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia to the United States during the period 1 October to 31 December 1974.
2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 11 April 1975 was sent to Liberia, requesting that the matter be investigated.
3. A first reminder was sent to Liberia on 17 June 1975.
4. In the absence of a reply from Liberia, the Committee included that Government in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.

5. A second reminder was sent to Liberia on 18 July and a third reminder on 21 August 1975.

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

Case No. USI-37. Chrome ore - "Ogden Sacramento": United States quarterly report dated 17 March 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 17 March 1975, the United States informed the Committee that the above-mentioned vessel, given as being of Panamanian registration, was one of the vessels used to transport chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia to the United States during the period 1 October to 31 December 1974.

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 11 April 1975 was sent to Panama requesting that the matter be investigated.

3. A first reminder was sent to Panama on 17 June 1975.

4. 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.

5. A second reminder was sent to Panama on 18 July, and a third reminder on 21 August 1975.

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

Case No. USI-38. High-carbon ferrochrome - "Ascendant": United States quarterly report dated 16 July 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 16 July 1975, the United States informed the Committee that the above-mentioned vessel, given as being of Panamanian registration, was one of the vessels used to transport chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia to the United States during the period 1 January to 30 June 1975.

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 20 August 1975 was sent to Panama, requesting that the matter be investigated.

3. A first reminder was sent to Panama on 22 October 1975.

Case No. USI-39. Chrome ore - "Safina-E-Rehmet": United States quarterly report dated 16 July 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 16 July 1975, the United States informed the Committee that the above-mentioned vessel, given as being of Pakistani registration, was one of the vessels used to transport chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia to the United States during the period 1 January to 30 June 1975.
2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 20 August 1975 was sent to Pakistan, requesting that the matter be investigated.
3. A reply dated 30 September 1975 has been received from the Government of Pakistan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Pakistan ... with reference to his note dated 20 August 1975, has the honour to state that the policy regarding imports and exports from Pakistan has been framed, bearing in mind the provisions of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council, and other United Nations resolutions. For instance, the Import Policy Order 1975, para. 7 (1) reads as follows:

"7. Sources of import. (1) Import under cash will be permissible from all countries except where otherwise specified. In case of loan, credit US PL-480, barter or trade agreement, import shall be made only from the source specified. No import shall be permissible from Israel, South Africa, Taiwan Province of the People's Republic of China, Rhodesia or of goods originating from any of these countries."

"Preliminary inquiries reveal that the Safina-E-Rehmet loaded the cargo in bulk. As such, the master of the ship was not aware of its origin. Nevertheless, the Pakistan Government has taken a serious view of this incident, and further investigations have been instituted to establish why due care was not exercised to ascertain the origin of the cargo. Suitable action will be taken against the person or persons found responsible for the negligence resulting in the breach of the above-mentioned import policy order of Pakistan. Information regarding such action will be conveyed to the Secretary-General in due course."

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 20 October 1975 was sent to Pakistan, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee, after considering the reply from His Excellency's Government dated 30 September 1975 concerning a consignment of chrome ore suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin and discharged in the port of Charleston, South Carolina (USA) on 13 June 1975, by the vessel Safina-E-Rehmet, decided to request the Secretary-General to express its appreciation to the Government of Pakistan for its co-operation.

"The Committee noted the intention of the Permanent Mission of Pakistan to communicate to it in due course the results of the investigation referred to in the Mission's note. The Committee requested the Secretary-General to indicate that it would appreciate receiving the results of this investigation at the earliest possible date. The Committee also expressed its confident hope that the greatest vigilance would continue to be exercised by the relevant authorities to assure that the mandatory sanctions of the Security Council are strictly enforced."

5. A reply dated 17 November 1975 was received from Pakistan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Ministry of Communication, Government of Pakistan, has conducted an inquiry into the matter. The investigation reveals that the carriage of ferrochrome by the Pan Islamic Steamship Company, the owners of the vessel, Safina-E-Rehmet, from Lourenço Marques (Mozambique) to Burnside (USA) was arranged by its general agents at New York, Messrs. Cross Ocean Shipping Company, Inc., while the vessel was hired to them on voyage charter basis. As such, the owners of the vessel could hardly have any knowledge about the origin of the cargo which their vessel, while on charter, was required to carry.

"The owners of the vessel have explained that the cargo which was loaded on the vessel did not bear any mark to indicate that the cargo originated from Southern Rhodesia. The normal practice of furnishing information of the cargo being only confined to its quantity and description and the ports of shipment and discharge.

"As far as the ports of shipment and discharge are concerned, the owners make sure that the vessel will not call either for loading or discharging at such ports against which the United Nations has imposed mandatory sanctions or those which are not recognized by the Government of Pakistan. This precaution is considered enough, as it is expected that Member States of the United Nations themselves would respect the sanctions imposed on a Member State by the Security Council.

"In this case, the ferro-chrome was exported from Lourenço Marques (Mozambique) to Burnside (USA), and since both countries are Members of the United Nations, their adherence to those sanctions becomes obligatory. The buyers of ferrochrome in USA must have been aware of the origin of the cargo they were importing, just as the suppliers in Mozambique must have been aware of the origin of the cargo they were exporting. Thus, the responsibility of the violations of the Security Council resolution rests with the exporting and the importing countries.

"The Government of Pakistan, has, however, taken a serious view of the matter. In order to ensure that no incident of this nature recurs, the following instructions have been issued to ship owners under section 7 of the Control of Shipping Ordinance, 1959:

(a) That masters of all vessels are to obtain invariably, while loading any cargo, a certificate that the cargo is not of Southern Rhodesian origin;

(b) To include invariably a clause in the charter party, if any, for a ship that no cargo of Southern Rhodesian origin would be carried;

(c) To direct all agents abroad, particularly at the ports through which imports and exports of Southern Rhodesia - a land-locked country - takes place, for example, ports of Lourenço Marques and Beira of Mozambique, for not booking any cargo of Southern Rhodesian origin."

Case No. USI-40. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kingston": United States quarterly report dated 16 July 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 16 July 1975, the United States informed the Committee that the above-mentioned vessel, given as being of Netherlands registration, was one of the vessels used to transport chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia to the United States during the period 1 January to 30 June 1975.

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 20 August 1975 was sent to the Netherlands, requesting that the matter be investigated.

3. A first reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 22 October 1975.

4. A reply dated 21 November 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigation carried out by the Netherlands Government has shown that the vessel MV Nedlloyd Kingston took in cargo at Durban between 1 and 3 November 1974. The cargo has been reported to contain '18 boxes electrolytic nickel cathodes' (18.936 kilograms) destined for Portland in the USA.

"Owing to delays, the MV Nedlloyd Kingston could be discharged only on 1 February 1975 in Seattle instead of Portland, the original port of destination,

"As the documents of lading indicated that the cargo came from the Republic of South Africa, there was no reason for the shipping agents to suppose it came from Southern Rhodesia and that it was, therefore, not acceptable.

"In the view of the Netherlands Government, therefore, there is no cause to believe that the shippers have acted knowingly in violation of paragraph 3 (c) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

5. At the time of preparation of the present report, action on the reply from the Netherlands was still under consideration by the Committee. That action included a proposal to inquire of the Netherlands the nature of documentary evidence examined by the investigating authorities, bearing in mind the documentary evidence recommended by the Committee in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971. The Committee would also request the United States to include this case among those in which it was contacting the Governments concerned on a bilateral basis, in an attempt to resolve the apparent discrepancies, as indicated in paragraph 7 of Case No. USI-19, above.

6. Meanwhile a communication dated 15 December 1975 was received from the representative of the United States, the text of which is reproduced below:

"I refer to Case No. USI-40, concerning electrolytic nickel cathodes. I would reiterate that our information is based on United States Customs Service documents prepared at the time and place of entry for the particular ship into the United States, as well as from the manifest of the ship concerned.

"We cannot explain why officials of the ship from the Netherlands gave different information to that Government, and suggest that the Committee continue to pursue that line of inquiry."

Annex IV

CASES OF TRANSACTIONS CONDUCTED WITH THE CONSENT OR KNOWLEDGE
OF REPORTING GOVERNMENTS

GRAPHITE

- (67) Case No. 38. "Kaapland": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
- (68) Case No. 43. "Tanga": United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
- (69) Case No. 62. "Transvaal", "Kaapland", "Stellenbosch" and "Swellendam":
United Kingdom note dated 22 December 1969

There is no new information concerning these cases in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

MEAT

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

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

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

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

OTHER

- (209) Case No. 133. Supply of medical equipment to the University of Southern Rhodesia: Swedish note dated 7 June 1972

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

- (214) Case No. 201. Danish trade with Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources submitted by Denmark

1. In implementation of a request made in 1967, Member States have periodically been sending to the Secretary-General statistical information concerning their foreign trade. The information is examined by the expert consultant and then forwarded to the United Nations Division of Statistics for possible inclusion in the analytical paper annually prepared on the matter by that Division.

2. Such information was submitted by the Permanent Representative of Denmark in a communication dated 28 November 1974. It indicated that during the period January-September 1974, Denmark exported to Southern Rhodesia aircraft and aircraft parts weighing 1,000 kg for a value of DKr 419,000. a/

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 14 January 1975 was sent to Denmark, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee received communication of the note dated 28 November 1974 (reference file No. 119.K.53.c/15.b.) from the Permanent Mission of Denmark, transmitting to the Secretary-General foreign statistical information about the imports and exports of Denmark during the period January-September 1974.

"The Committee was surprised and dismayed to read in the enclosures attached to that note that during the period concerned, Denmark exported to Southern Rhodesia 1,000 kg of aircraft material for a value of DKr 419,000.

"The Committee considered the matter particularly serious and requested the Secretary-General to inquire of the Danish Government concerning the circumstances under which such transaction took place."

4. An acknowledgement dated 10 February 1975 was received from Denmark.

5. A reminder was sent to Denmark on 24 March 1975.

6. A reply dated 7 April 1975 was received from Denmark, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As appears from the statistical data on imports and exports of Denmark during the period January-September 1974 transmitted to the Secretary-General by a note dated 28 November 1974, the balance of the total export to Southern Rhodesia during the above-mentioned period amounted to DKr 419,000 (about \$US 53,000).

"Investigations carried out by the competent Danish authorities have confirmed the fact that no aircraft material has, as mentioned in the Secretary-General's note, been exported to Southern Rhodesia. Neither does the statistical material indicate that such an export has taken place."

7. In a note dated 4 June 1975, the expert consultant informed the Committee that the inference that Denmark's exports to Southern Rhodesia consisted of aircraft materials had been obtained from the figures submitted by Denmark itself, in which the only row corresponding to figures of 1,000 kg and DKr 419,000 was listed under the heading "aircraft and parts" of Denmark's exports.

a/ Equivalent to \$US 68,452.45.

8. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a further note dated 20 June 1975 was sent to Denmark, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has examined His Excellency's reply dated 7 April 1975 concerning its inquiries into the exports to Southern Rhodesia by Denmark, reported in the figures returned by the Government for the period January-September 1974. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the reply thus received. It noted the Government's denial that any aircraft materials were ever exported to Southern Rhodesia during that period. The Committee had obtained inference to that effect from the figures submitted by the Government of Denmark itself, since, as the attached photocopy of an extract from those figures shows, the only row of figures corresponding to the figures of 1,000 kg (1 ton) and DKr 419,000 is listed under the heading 'aircraft and parts'.

"Nevertheless, the Committee is still gravely concerned that whatever the nature of the exports to Southern Rhodesia was, the conduct of such trade with the illegal régime might have been contrary to Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against that régime. The Committee would therefore be interested to know the nature of the goods exported to Southern Rhodesia and the circumstances in which such trade was permitted to take place by the Government of Denmark."

9. A reply dated 26 June 1975 was received from Denmark, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"During the period of January-September 1974 there has been an export from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia of a value of Dkr. 419,000 as stated in form III of the statistical material presented to the Secretary-General. These Dkr. 419,000 do not cover any export of aircraft material. The figure Dkr. 419,000 concerning the export from Denmark in form II applies to consumption country (forbr. land) No. 036 which according to the Danish nomenclature is Switzerland. The Permanent Representative of Denmark was not aware that the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia was not in possession of the Danish nomenclature. A copy of the nomenclature has now been forwarded to the Secretary-General with a note, dated 19 June 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Denmark.

"Concerning the export from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia of the value of Dkr. 419,000 that has taken place during the period of January-September 1974 (the existence of two figures of Dkr. 419,000 is purely accidental) the Permanent Representative of Denmark has the honour to state that 97 per cent of the export concerns products as mentioned in Security Council resolution 253 (1968), paragraph 3 (d), supplies intended strictly for medical purposes.

"As for the remaining 3 per cent of the export the Permanent Representative of Denmark has asked the Danish authorities for further clarification."

(216) Case No. 214. Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources submitted by Switzerland

1. In implementation of a request made in 1967, Member States have periodically been sending to the Secretary-General statistical information concerning their foreign trade. The information is examined by the expert consultant and then forwarded to the Division of Statistics for possible inclusion in the analytical paper annually prepared on the matter by that Division.

2. Such information was submitted by the Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations in a communication dated 2 May 1975. It indicated that during the period January-March 1975, Switzerland's imports from and exports to Southern Rhodesia amounted to SwF 4,195,780 and SwF 2,819,845 respectively b/ (see the tables below prepared by the expert consultant).

Table 1

SWITZERLAND IMPORTS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA
DURING THE FIRST QUARTER OF 1975

BTN	Description of commodity	Quantity (kg)	Value (SwF)
0201	Meat and edible meat offals of animals	64,071	656,595
2401	Unmanufactured tobacco	269,066	2,344,706
	Total	333,137	3,001,301
	Other commodities not listed . . .	156,409	1,194,479
	Grand total	489,546	4,195,780

b/ Equivalent to \$US 1,683,700 for total exports and \$US 1,131,559 for total imports. The average exchange rate for the first quarter of 1975 was 2.492 SwF = \$US 1.

Table 2

SWITZERLAND EXPORTS TO SOUTHERN RHODESIA
DURING THE FIRST QUARTER OF 1975

BTN	Description of commodity	Quantity (kg)	Value (SwF)
2908	Ethers, ether-alcohols, ether-phenols, ether-alcohol-phenols, alcohol peroxides and ether peroxides, and their halogenated, sulphonated, nitrated or nitrosated derivatives.	200	10,180
3003	Pharmaceutical products-medicaments (including veterinary medicaments).	369	48,982
3005	Other pharmaceutical goods.	42	6,059
3205	Synthetic organic dyestuffs, etc.	4,455	108,207
3402	Organic surface-active agents, etc. whether or not containing soap.	2,500	17,310
3702	Film in rolls, sensitized, unexposed, perforated or not.	662	55,013
3812	Prepared glazings, prepared dressings and prepared mordants, of a kind used in the textile, paper, leather or like industries.	5,100	24,345
5505	Cotton yarn, not put up for retail sale.	177	7,180
5607	Woven fabrics of man-made fibres.	160	5,677
5810	Embroidery, in pieces, in strips or in motifs.	175	41,958
7604	Aluminium foil, etc.	2,430	34,397
8315	Wire, rods, tubes, plates, electrodes, etc.	420	15,477
8406	Internal combustion piston engines (aircraft engines and others).	129	31,120
8419	Machinery for cleaning or drying bottles or other containers; machinery for filling, closing, sealing, capsuling or labelling bottles, cans, boxes, etc.	35	2,706

Table 2 (continued)

BTN	Description of commodity	Quantity (kg)	Value (SwF)
8440	Machinery for washing, cleaning, drying, bleaching, dyeing, etc.	4	2,700
8441	Sewing machines, etc.	166	8,032
8461	Tops, corks, valves and similar appliances, etc.	113	5,493
8522	Electrical goods and apparatus, etc.	40	4,050
9008	Cinematographic cameras, projectors, etc.	182	11,715
9012	Compound optical microscopes, etc.	16	4,412
9014	Surveying (including photogrammetrical surveying), hydrographic, etc.	133	17,233
9017	Medical, dental, surgical and veterinary instruments and appliances.	28	6,931
9024	Instruments and apparatus for measuring, checking, etc. of liquids or gases.	128	27,122
9101	Pocket-watches, wrist-watches, etc.	1,056	36,352
9111	Other clock and watch parts.	4	4,183
	Total	<u>18,724</u>	<u>536,834</u>
	Other commodities not listed . .	<u>80,807</u>	<u>2,283,011</u>
	Grand total	<u><u>99,531</u></u>	<u><u>2,819,845</u></u>

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 28 July 1975 was sent to Switzerland, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee received communication of the note dated 2 May 1975 from the Permanent Observer of Switzerland, transmitting to the Secretary-General the foreign trade statistics of Switzerland during the period January-March 1975.

"The Committee noted that, during the period concerned, Switzerland had imports from and exports to Southern Rhodesia amounting to SwF 4,195,780 and SwF 2,819,845 respectively.

"The Committee considered the matter particularly serious. Keeping in mind the text of the note of 13 May 1974 in which, in connexion with Case No. 113 the Swiss Government stated that although for reason of principle Switzerland was unable to consider itself bound by the United Nations decision instituting sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, '... it would however take precautions to ensure that Rhodesian trade should not escape the United Nations measures by making use of the Swiss territory', c/ the Committee decided to request the Secretary-General to inquire of the Swiss Government concerning the circumstances in which such trade was permitted to take place."

4. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 8 October 1975.

5. 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.

6. A second reminder was sent to Switzerland on 12 November 1975.

7. A reply dated 20 November 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 the notes of 28 July, 8 October and 12 November 1975 in which the Secretary-General informed him of the concern expressed by the Sanctions Committee of the Security Council about the statistics for trade between Switzerland and Southern Rhodesia during the period January-March 1975.

"After giving careful consideration to the question raised by the Sanctions Committee, the Swiss authorities are in a position to make the following comments regarding the matter.

c/ See S/11594/Rev.1, para. 88.

"In order to prevent Swiss territory from being used by Rhodesian commercial interests for the purpose of circumventing sanctions, the Federal Council independently decided, as the Committee is aware, to establish quotas for imports from Southern Rhodesia. The annual statistics for Switzerland's foreign trade, which are the only ones relevant in the matter, show that so far this independent measure has been consistently applied and had had the anticipated effects.

"With regard to the statistics for the first quarter of 1975, referred to in the above-mentioned notes of the Secretary-General, the Swiss authorities take the liberty of pointing out that it is hardly possible to draw conclusions from them for the entire year 1975. Only when the annual statistics for 1975 become available will it be possible to make a comparison with the statistics for previous years."

Annex V

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

Case No. INGO-2. Joba/Etb. Zephyr Co., Amsterdam: information supplied by the Anti-Apartheids Beweging Nederland

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. As indicated in the seventh report (S/11594/Rev.1, annex V, Case No. INGO-2, para. 6), the proposed note was sent to the Netherlands on 19 December 1974.
4. A reply dated 4 March 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The suspicions that had meanwhile arisen in relation to trading company Etablissement Zephyr Holland BV - of which Joba and Zephyr are managers - have led to a profound investigation by the competent Netherlands authorities. Consequently, the matter was put before the district court in Amsterdam.

"On 13 June 1974, the said district court imposed a fine on the two managers of the Etablissement Zephyr Holland BV in the amount of fl. 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."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 241st meeting, a note dated 8 July 1975 was sent to Switzerland, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of the note is reproduced below:

"Some time ago, the Committee was informed of the business transactions of a Dutch establishment, Joba/Zephyr, with companies operating in Southern Rhodesia. The Committee brought this information to the attention of the Netherlands Government, which, having investigated the matter, decided to take it to court. It was proved that the establishment in question had contravened Dutch legislation concerning the implementation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, and the two directors of the company were convicted by a court in Amsterdam.

"The Committee would at this time like to draw the attention of the Federal Government to information from the same source indicating that the Zephyr firm in question has branches in Switzerland. In particular, the following correspondents have been mentioned:

Sublistatic S.A.
91, Route de la Capite
1223 Cologny, Geneva (2089, 336)

Altradico S.A.
Case Postale 133
1211 Geneva 3

J. G. Nef and Co., Ltd.
Herisau (9,6,10,8)

"Furthermore, another firm is said to have a direct interest in the affairs of the Zephyr company, namely the Lemano Trust Company, 12 bis Place Saint François Xavier, Lausanne. It would seem that this company is largely concerned with promoting exports to Rhodesia.

"The Committee hopes that His Excellency's Government will be good enough to carry out a detailed investigation into the activities of these firms. The Committee would be pleased to receive any information on this question as soon as possible and preferably within one month, including an indication of what measures, if any, the Federal Government might have to take in this regard."

6. At the 242nd meeting, the representative of France made a statement by which he informed the Committee that as soon as his Government received information about the possible activities of the Société Commerciale d'Affrètement et de Combustibles (SCAC), it had undertaken an investigation, the results of which he wished to report to the Committee. It had emerged that the French customs service had not found that that shipping company had violated the French regulations on sanctions adopted pursuant to the relevant United Nations resolutions. Nevertheless, his Government had decided to give stricter instructions to the customs service to eliminate as fully as possible the danger that a violation might occur. His Government had also requested SCAC not to grant any facilities to Affretair, a company established under Gabonese law. SCAC had replied that it had ceased to authorize Affretair to use its telex since October 1973. His Government intended, however, to keep the matter under review and would not fail to examine with equal diligence any additional documents which the Committee might receive in that regard.

7. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 15 September and a second reminder on 14 November 1975.

Case No. INGO-3. Tour of certain African countries, including Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by the Mouvement pour la défense de la paix en Finlande

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 Finland, 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 10 March 1975 has been received from Finland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"According to the investigation a Finnish weekly magazine, Suomen Kuvalehti and a travel bureau, the Olympia Travel Bureau, organized a tour in Africa from 19 December 1973 to 12 January 1974, which included a visit to the Victoria Falls in Southern Rhodesia. The trip was made by air from Helsinki via Copenhagen to Nairobi in an SAS aeroplane and from Nairobi to Blantyre-Malawi in an Air Malawi aeroplane. From Blantyre to Salisbury the flight had taken place in an aeroplane of the Southern Rhodesian Air Rhodesia Corporation. The date of arrival at Salisbury was 22 December 1973. From Salisbury to the Victoria Falls airport in the vicinity of the Zambian border the flight had taken place in an aeroplane of the Air Rhodesia Corporation. After the celebration of Christmas in Victoria Falls area the tour was continued by air by the Air Rhodesia Corporation to the town of Bulawayo in Southern Rhodesia and from there on 26 December 1973 to Cape Town in South Africa. From Johannesburg the tour had been continued by a Pan Am flight to Kinshasa, Congo, and further by a Sabena flight to Brussels, from where the return journey to Helsinki took place by Finnair.

"All the flights were regular commercial flights. The flight to or from Southern Rhodesia was not undertaken by means of an aircraft owned by a Finnish airline company or of Finnish registration or under charter to a national of Finland. The flight reservations and relevant payments were made by the Finnish organizers of the tour through airline companies and travel agencies representing third countries. In other words, payments pertaining to the tour have not been made from Finland direct to South Rhodesia or to Southern Rhodesian companies.

"The Chancellor of Justice, the supreme prosecuting authority in Finland, who has been in charge of the investigation of this matter, has stated on the strength of the foregoing, that, although the trip and the procedure in connexion with organizing it may be liable to criticism, legal grounds do not exist to bring the matter before a court of law on the basis of the statute promulgated in Finland on 26 July 1968 on the fulfilment of obligations arising from resolution 253 (1968) on Southern Rhodesia adopted by the United Nations Security Council on 29 May 1968.

"Corresponding trips have not been organized to Southern Rhodesia from Finland subsequently."

5. In connexion with that reply, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that airlines or agencies which made travel reservations on Air Rhodesia flights from Johannesburg to Salisbury and from Blantyre, Malawi, to Salisbury, received payment for those flights in the cities in which the reservations were made. Since Air Rhodesia was not a member of the International Air Transport

Association, through which international airlines settled accounts with each other, it was assumed that the airlines or agencies concerned had to transfer funds directly to Air Rhodesia.

Case No. INGO-4. Air Rhodesia and IATA agreements: information supplied by the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ, New York

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 Argentina, Belgium, Israel, and Malaysia, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 24 February 1975 from Argentina

"Aerolíneas Argentinas, in a note dated 15 July 1974, denounced to the International Air Transport Association the multilateral interline traffic agreement, passenger and cargo, with Air Rhodesia."

(ii) Note dated 24 February 1975 from Belgium

"Like many other airlines, Sabena has concluded standardized multilateral interline agreements, but there is no bilateral agreement with Air Rhodesia. Sabena has no route to or from Southern Rhodesia and does not organize group travel to that country."

(iii) Note dated 28 February 1975 from Israel

"In corrigendum No. 2-1-4 to page 25 of the seventh edition of the International Air Transport Association interline agreements manual, Air Rhodesia is no longer on the list of airline companies with which El Al Israel Airlines has passenger and/or cargo agreements."

(iv) Note dated 6 March 1975 from Malaysia

"The Permanent Mission of Malaysia has the honour to inform that Malaysian Airline System's signing of the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreement automatically listed it as a signatory airline together with Air Rhodesia, in view of the general conditions outlined in the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreement. This anomaly has since been corrected when, on 15 June 1974, Malaysian Airlines System filed an 'exception', effective 1 July 1974, to the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreement in respect of Air Rhodesia. It is therefore evident that Malaysian Airlines System has not violated the provisions of paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). The Permanent Mission of Malaysia wishes to also inform that Malaysia does not have

any legislation or administrative orders relevant to the implementation of paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). The Permanent Mission of Malaysia would be most grateful if this clarification could be brought to the attention of the Security Council Committee."

4. In the absence of replies from Botswana, Brazil, Cyprus, Greece, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malawi, Mexico, the Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Switzerland and Zambia, the Committee included those Governments in the sixth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 March 1975.

5. Replies were received from Singapore, Indonesia, Jamaica, the United Kingdom and Switzerland, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 3 April 1975 from Singapore

"The Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of Singapore to the United Nations wishes to state that the Government of Singapore has investigated the information contained in the IATA Manual in relation to Singapore Airlines Limited and has the honour to advise that on 27 June 1974, Singapore Airlines Limited sent a letter to IATA, advising them of its intention to withdraw from the interline agreement with Air Rhodesia with effect from 27 July 1974. Subsequently, on 5 July 1974, IATA issued a memorandum TS-52/1506 to its members and also to non-IATA airlines informing them of the action taken by Singapore Airlines Limited. A copy of the said memorandum is attached herewith for your consideration.

"Accordingly, the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of Singapore to the United Nations would be grateful if the Secretary-General of the United Nations could inform the Security Council Committee of the action already taken by the Singapore Government resulting in the termination of the interline agreement between Singapore Airlines Limited and Air Rhodesia and request the Committee to include this information in the next periodic list to be issued by the Security Council Committee."

Attachment

"Memorandum dated 5 July 1974 Traffic Services Administrator, IATA entitled 'IATA Interline Traffic Agreements - Withdrawals'

"1. By letter dated 21 June 1974, Continental Airlines advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements - passenger and cargo - insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with immediate effect.

"2. By letter dated 26 June 1974, Air Inter advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements - passenger and cargo - insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with immediate effect.

"3. By letter dated 27 June 1974 Singapore Airlines Limited advised IATA that, in accordance with subparagraph (4) (a) (i) of article IX of the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements - passenger and cargo - they withdraw from these agreements insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with effect from 27 July 1974.

"4. By telex dated 1 July 1974 Pan American World Airways advised IATA that, by reason of United States law, they withdraw from the IATA multilateral indemnification agreement for the recovery of accountable transportation documents, with immediate effect, insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned.

"5. By telex dated 3 July 1974 Syrian Arab Airlines advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreement - passenger and cargo - insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with immediate effect.

"6. By telex dated 19 June 1974, New Zealand National Airways advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements - passenger and cargo - insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with immediate effect."

(ii) Note dated 14 April 1975 from Indonesia

"With regard to the interline agreements with Air Rhodesia, the attention of the Committee is drawn to the statement made by the Indonesian representative to the Sanctions Committee during the Committee's consideration of the case that the Indonesian Airline GARUDA has, in pursuance of the Committee's request, already terminated its interline agreement with Air Rhodesia. In conformity with the termination clause of that agreement, GARUDA has notified IATA to that effect."

(iii) Note dated 14 April 1974 from Jamaica

"Attached is a photostatic copy of IATA memorandum TS-52/1500 concerning, inter alia, the withdrawal by Air Jamaica from the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with effect from 29 June 1974.

"The Permanent Mission of Jamaica to the United Nations would be grateful if the Secretary-General of the United Nations would insure that the contents of this note receives adequate publicity within the United Nations."

Attachment

IATA memorandum TS-52/1500 - withdrawals

"7. By letter dated 24 May 1974, Polish Airlines advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline agreements - passenger and cargo, insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation and South African Airways, S.A., are concerned, with immediate effect.

"8. By telex dated 28 May 1974, CP Air advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements - passenger and cargo, insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with immediate effect.

"9. By telex dated 29 May 1974, Air India advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline agreements - passenger and cargo, insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with immediate effect.

"10. By telex dated 30 May 1974, Air Jamaica (1968), Ltd., advised IATA that, in accordance with article IX, subparagraph (4) (a) (i) of the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements - passenger and cargo, they withdraw from these agreements insofar as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned, with effect from 29 June 1974."

(iv) Statement by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 233rd meeting

"At the 193rd meeting of the Committee on 8 May 1974, a special statement was adopted which included a reference to the airlines listed in the IATA Interline Agreements Manual as having arrangements with Air Rhodesia. One of the airlines so listed was Leeward Islands Air Transport Services, Ltd. (LIAT). I am now able to confirm that the General Manager of LIAT has formally notified the office of the Deputy British Government Representative in Antigua that LIAT does not participate in an interline passenger and cargo agreement with Air Rhodesia."

(v) Note dated 22 April 1975 from Switzerland

"The investigation carried out by the federal authorities in this connexion has shown that the two agreements listed by IATA, namely, an 'interline agreement' and a 'general sales agency agreement', were originally concluded by Swissair with Central African Airways and subsequently maintained with Air Rhodesia. These two agreements were terminated by Swissair on 31 October and 30 November 1974, respectively.

6. During its consideration of the general subject "Interline agreements with Air Rhodesia" a/ at the 238th meeting on 22 May 1975, the Committee decided to request the Secretariat to find any available information on airlines from third countries that might have interline agreements with South African Airways permitting airline connexions between Southern Rhodesia and such third countries. At the same meeting the representative of Iraq also informed the Committee that South African Airways operated a direct air link between London, Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia and Johannesburg, with a stop-over in Paris. Consequently, the Committee also requested the Secretariat to seek confirmation of the information supplied by the representative of Iraq.

7. In accordance with the Committee's decision also at the same meeting, special reminders were sent to the following Governments that had by that date not yet

a/ See also chap. I, paras. 7 and 20, and annex I of this report.

replied to the Secretary-General's note of 13 May 1974: Botswana, Brazil, Cyprus, Greece, Malawi, Mexico, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sri Lanka, South Africa and Zambia.

8. At the 239th meeting on 29 May 1975, the representative of the United States made a statement concerning the case, the text of which is reproduced below:

"I have received confirmation from the United States Federal Aviation Administration, through the United States Department of State, to the effect that no United States-registered airline has an interline agreement with Air Rhodesia."

9. Further to paragraph 6 above, the Secretariat, in a note dated 5 June 1975, reported to the Committee that, according to information obtained from Thomas Cook and Son, Inc., b/ travel agents, the following countries had direct airlinks 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. c/

<u>Airline</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Country</u>
Air Malawi Ltd.	QM	Malawi
DETA	TM	Portugal (Mozambique)
South African Airways	SA	South Africa
TAP	TP	Portugal

10. The following airlines had direct airlinks with South Africa. It was not immediately known by Thomas Cook and Son, Inc., whether any of them had interline agreements with South African Airways to drop or pick up passengers or cargoes in South Africa destined for or originating from Southern Rhodesia. It was pointed out, however, that all airlines subscribing to IATA interline agreements were under obligation to pick up or drop passengers or cargoes within the territory they served, regardless of the origin or final destination of such passengers or cargoes. Thomas Cook and Son, Inc., could not confirm, either, whether any of the airlines listed below could carry passengers or cargoes with through tickets to Southern Rhodesia or those with through tickets issued in Southern Rhodesia.

b/ The information was obtained mainly from the Official Airline Guide, June 1975 edition, a monthly publication produced under the auspices of IATA. The information refers only to scheduled flights operated through IATA, and not to chartered or private flights.

c/ The names of Governments whose airlines had not, as of 28 May 1975, indicated any measures taken with regard to their interline agreements with Air Rhodesia, pursuant to the Secretary-General's note of 13 May 1974, are given in para. 7 of their case.

<u>Airline</u>	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Country of registration</u>
Air Botswana (Pty)	BP	Botswana
Air Madagascar	MD	Madagascar
Air Malawi, Ltd.	QM	Malawi
Air Rhodesia	RH	Southern Rhodesia
ALITALIA	AZ	Italy
British Airways	BA	United Kingdom
KLM	KL	Netherlands
Deutsche Lufthansa, AG.	LH	Federal Republic of Germany
Olympic Airways, SA	OA	Greece
Pan American Airways, Inc.	PA	United States
QUANTAS	QF	Australia
Sabena	SN	Belgium
SAS	SK	Sweden
Swissair	SR	Switzerland
TAP	TP	Portugal
UTA	UT	France
VARIG, S.A.	RG	Brazil

11. According to information further supplied by Thomas Cook and Son, Inc., South African Airways operated a direct service between Paris and Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, and between Salisbury and Paris, once a week each way, as well as between London and Salisbury and between Salisbury and London, twice a week each way.

12. A reply dated 8 July 1975 was received from the Philippines, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Philippines to the United Nations ... is pleased to state that the Philippine Air Lines, Inc., withdrew from the IATA passenger and/or cargo agreements, or parts thereof, with Air Rhodesia, on 7 June 1974, and that Air Manila, Inc., withdrew on 4 June 1975.

"The Philippine Government reaffirms its support of the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council against Southern Rhodesia, and of resolution 253 (1968), as well as of resolutions 3297 (XXIX), 3298 (XXIX), 3299 (XXIX), 3300 (XXIX) concerning Southern Rhodesia and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

"It is regretted that the violation had occurred inadvertently, but the Philippine Government gives assurance that it was not willfully done and that it is doing everything possible to prevent its recurrence.

"The Philippine Government remains committed today, as from the beginning, to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, South Africa and in all other territories under colonial domination and to the efforts of the United Nations and the decolonization committees as well as the Organization of African Unity to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa.

"It will be appreciated if this note can be communicated as early as possible to the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, as well as to the Special Committee of 24. The Philippine Government wishes to extend its appreciation to the Committee for its vigilance."

13. Further to paragraph 7, above, in the absence of replies from them, the Committee again included Botswana, Brazil, Cyprus, Greece, Malawi, Mexico, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka and Zambia in the seventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 10 July 1975.

14. In view of the information submitted by the Secretariat in paragraph 11 above, the representative of Sweden in a note dated 22 July 1975, put forward a specific proposal on the application of sanctions in the field of civil aviation. For the substance of the Swedish proposal and for additional information in that connexion, see the Committee's special report (S/11913, d/ especially para. 7 and the annex) as well as (207) Case No. 213 in annex II to the present report.

15. A reply dated 28 July 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"the competent Spanish authorities report that on 19 June 1975, ... Iberia cancelled the agreements it had with Air Rhodesia within the framework of IATA and Aviaco cancelled its agreements on 9 July 1975.

"Please be good enough to convey this information to the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia."

16. Second reminders were sent to Botswana, Brazil, Cyprus, Greece, Malawi, Mexico, Portugal, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Zambia on 29 July 1975.

17. A reply dated 30 July 1975 was received from Zambia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Zambia to the United Nations ... has the honour to state that when it came to the notice of the Zambian

d/ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1975.

Government that Air Rhodesia participated in the IATA multilateral interline agreements and that some IATA and non-IATA carriers had appointed agents in Rhodesia, instructions were issued by the Zambian Government to all IATA and non-IATA carriers in Zambia, including travel agents, to withdraw their concurrences or appointments as the case was with effect from 5 July 1975.

"Zambia Airways operates flights to Botswana and Malawi, and all travel agents have been instructed by the Government of Zambia not to issue tickets for flights to Rhodesia as Zambia Airways does not fly to Rhodesia. Passengers intending to go to Rhodesia from Zambia can only be issued with flight tickets up to Malawi only. Thereafter, they have to make their own arrangements in getting to Rhodesia.

"The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Zambia further wishes to state that Zambia Airways has never maintained passenger and cargo agreements with Air Rhodesia. IATA and non-IATA carriers in Zambia had some connexions with Air Rhodesia which have been terminated as stated above."

18. Further to the note dated 8 July 1975, a note dated 31 July 1975 was received from the Philippines, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In a letter to the Mission dated 3 July 1975, H.E. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, confirmed the contents of the aforementioned note of the Mission, as follows:

'The IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements (passenger and cargo) indicate that the Philippine Airlines, as of 1 September 1969, and Air Manila, as of 1 November 1972, had become parties thereto with respect to Air Rhodesia as a result of their concurrence to the IATA notice of 23 November 1967 that Air Rhodesia had applied for participation in said agreements on 30 October 1967.

'The Philippine Airlines has informed the Department that it ceased to be a party to the aforementioned agreements with respect to Air Rhodesia as of 7 June 1974. Enclosed is a copy of its letter dated 8 May 1974, advising IATA of its withdrawal.

'Air Manila has likewise withdrawn from the agreements with respect to Air Rhodesia, in accordance with its enclosed letter to IATA dated 4 June 1975.'

"It is relevant to state in this connexion that the Philippine Government prohibits Filipino travellers from visiting Southern Rhodesia and that it does not grant visas to nationals of Southern Rhodesia."

19. A reply dated 18 August 1975 was also received from Mexico, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As the Secretary of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia was duly informed, this Mission did not receive the note dated 13 May 1974, and it was not until 13 March 1975 that the Mexican Mission learnt, from press release SC/3612, e/ that Aeronaves de México, S.A., was included in the list.

"The Government of Mexico accorded special priority to this case and discussed it with the airline, as a result of which the following comments were forthcoming:

'(1) Aeronaves de México, S.A., has not committed any violation of the sanctions imposed against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, since it has not actually entered into any agreement with Air Rhodesia. Rather, the problem arises because Aeronaves is a member of IATA, which agreed to the admission of Air Rhodesia by a unanimous vote of all its members. However, this occurred before the United Nations Security Council adopted its resolution 253 (1968) establishing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

'(2) Furthermore, the admission of members to IATA is not effected by a vote of the entire membership. Rather, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article IV (2) of the IATA Articles of Association, "Any air transport enterprise is eligible to membership as an active member if it operates a scheduled air service under proper authority in the transport of passengers, mail or cargo for public hire between the territories of two or more States, under the flag of a State eligible to membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization as provided for in Chicago in 1944".

'(3) In addition, in accordance with article IV (4), "Applications to membership in the Association shall be submitted in writing for the consideration and action of the Executive Committee and such members, whether active or associate, will become members only after approval by such Committee".

'(4) In his note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1), the Secretary-General of the United Nations recalls 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". In that connexion, Aeronaves de México, S.A., neither operates at any Southern Rhodesian airport nor has any flights which link up with those of Air Rhodesia.'

e/ See para. 4 of this case.

"The Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations would inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that the Government of Mexico is studying the possibility of making a declaration to IATA expressing its opposition to Air Rhodesia's continued membership in the Association, and takes this opportunity to renew to him the assurances of his highest consideration."

20. An acknowledgement dated 26 August 1975 was received from Sri Lanka.

21. A reply dated 30 September 1975 was received from Sri Lanka, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform that in accordance with the interline traffic agreement manual, seventh edition of 1 July 1974 (section 4, page 5), Sri Lanka has no interline agreement with Rhodesian airlines."

22. Further to paragraph 10, above, in the absence of replies from them, the Committee again included Botswana, Brazil, Cyprus, Greece, Malawi, Portugal and South Africa in the eighth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 4 November 1975.

23. A further reply dated 12 November 1975 was received from Sri Lanka, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations ... further to his note of 30 September 1975, has the honour to inform that in accordance with memorandum No. TS-52/1504, dated 7 January 1974 issued under the signature of Mr. A. D. Groenewege, Traffic Services Administrator of IATA, the following has been circularized to all airlines:

"In consequence of the Executive Committee decisions, IATA has, with effect from 1 July 1974, ceased to carry out the functions assigned to it under the IATA interline agreements with respect to Air Rhodesia Corporation. Accordingly, the name of Air Rhodesia Corporation no longer is listed as a participant in the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreement - passenger and cargo, and the multilateral indemnification agreement for the recovery of accountable transportation documents."

24. Third reminders were sent to Botswana, Brazil, Cyprus, Greece, Malawi, Portugal and South Africa on 5 December 1975.

Case No. INGO-5. Ferrochrome imported into Spain: information obtained from non-governmental 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 16 June 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigations made by the competent Spanish authorities concerning five consignments of ferro-chrome imported by Cometal, SA, of Madrid, have provided no evidence that these shipments originated in Southern Rhodesia.

"In accordance with the request made in the above-mentioned communications, I take pleasure in transmitting photo-copies of the certificates of origin provided by the company in question."

4. The documentation enclosed consisted of four certificates of origin issued by the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce in respect of a total of 1,609,000 kg (1,475,960 kg net) of ferrochrome declared to be of South African origin. To each certificate was also attached a completed import declaration form of the Spanish Ministry of Trade in respect of the ferrochrome. Each declaration form listed Cometal S.A., Madrid, as the buyer and Handelsgesellschaft in Zurich, A.G., as the exporter and seller of the ferrochrome.

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a further note dated 20 October 1975 was sent to Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Committee examined the reply contained in the note of the Permanent Representative of Spain dated 16 June 1975 concerning the cargo of ferro-chrome, suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, shipped to Spain. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the co-operation of the Government of Spain in assisting it in the performance of its task.

"The Committee, however, considered that the investigating authorities should base their findings on documents other than the certificate of origin mentioned in His Excellency's note of 16 June 1975. In that connexion, it felt that the attention of the Spanish Government should be drawn to the contents of the Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 relating to documentary proof of origin.

"In accordance with the Committee's request, the Secretary-General would appreciate receiving from His Excellency's Government at its earliest convenience, if possible within one month, any available information and documentation as well as any comments regarding the present case."

6. A reply dated 24 October 1975 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations ... with reference to the Secretary-General's communication of 20 October 1975 concerning Case No. INGO-5, has the honour to inform him that it has transmitted the text of the above-mentioned note to its Government, calling particular attention to the third paragraph of the note.

"Should the Spanish authorities have any further information on this case, the Permanent Representative will transmit it to the Secretary-General."

Case No. INGO-6. Tobacco report: Report submitted by the Anti-Apartheids
Bewegings Nederland, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

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, the substantive portion of which reads as follows:

"The Netherlands Government has taken due note of the report. Before the report was published, however, the Netherlands Government had already decided to make an extensive inquiry into this question against the possibility that Southern Rhodesian tobacco might illegally be imported into the Netherlands.

"The information contained in the aforesaid report was also used for the purposes of the investigation. The investigation focused on the provenance and the origin of the tobacco and the methods of payment used by the manufacturers of cigarettes and tobacco in the Netherlands. The inquiries did not, however, establish that any of the buyers investigated had imported tobacco originating in Southern Rhodesia.

"It should be noted that for purchases of any significance, in most cases certificates of origin were found which confirmed that the tobacco originated elsewhere than in Southern Rhodesia. Neither did the destination of the payments for the purchases concerned point to any relation with Southern Rhodesia.

"The inquiries were hampered because of the fact that many of the purchases investigated were not effected completely independently by the Netherlands manufacturers. This is a result of the strong concentration of the European cigarette industry.

"In many cases it was evident that the necessary purchase documents were in the hands of affiliates abroad.

"Concerning the question for an explanation of the statement by the Dutch Anti-Apartheid Movement that the quantity of tobacco imported into the Netherlands from Mozambique in 1972 amounted to more than the total quantity of tobacco exported by Mozambique during that year, the Netherlands Government would like to make the following comments.

"The Netherlands Government has, for a long time, been critically viewing the statistical data regarding the import of tobacco from southern Africa. Based on these data the decision was made to conduct the aforesaid investigation into the tobacco import from Southern Rhodesia.

"As a result of the insufficient insight into the statistical methods and definitions applied by the Mozambique Government for the establishment of statistical export figures, it has been difficult to draw concrete conclusions from comparisons between statistical and export figures of Mozambique, on the one hand, and Netherlands statistics, on the other. In addition, the final destination of shipments from remote countries like Mozambique is often decided upon after the shipments have left the exporting country.

"In this connexion, it should be noted that as far as Mozambique is concerned, statistical reviews presented by the Secretary-General before 1965 also showed considerable discrepancies between the export figures submitted by that country and import figures from Mozambique submitted by other countries.

"The question can be raised whether the authorities of Mozambique obtain full information of all exports from that country. At any rate, the export statistics of Mozambique do not appear reliable as far as it concerns the question of rerouting Southern Rhodesian goods.

"As already indicated in its answer to the note of the Secretary-General of 3 August 1973, No. PO 230 SORH (1-2-1), the Netherlands Government has established an interdepartmental Committee, consisting of officials of all ministries involved in the implementation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, with the instruction to study the extent to which the implementation of the sanctions can be assured as much as possible within the framework of earlier regulations.

"Moreover, it was to study whatever new regulations or which revisions of existing regulations were required in order to assure the enforcement of the sanctions in the most scrutinizing way.

"The Committee has now issued its report, in which some suggestions have been offered about the way in which the implementation of the sanctions can be improved. The report has been presented to the Council of Ministers.

"The Netherlands Government wishes to take this opportunity to confirm once again that the import of Southern Rhodesian tobacco is being kept under close surveillance.

"Violators of regulations enacted to terminate the illegal importation of Southern Rhodesian goods are being prosecuted in the Netherlands and subsequently punished if found guilty."

4. A letter dated 24 April 1975 and addressed to the Chairman was received from the Permanent Representative of Austria to the United Nations. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

"I am writing to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) and would like to refer to the annexes to the seventh annual report of the Committee, which appeared a few days ago. Annex V contains, among others, documentation about Case No. INGO-6, concerning the so-called 'tobacco report' of the Dutch Anti-Apartheid Movement. After reproducing a short version of the report itself, reference is made to a statement of the Austrian representative in the Committee, commenting on certain parts of the 'tobacco report'.

"In this statement, the Austrian representative informed the Committee that those parts of the report referring to the Austria Einkaufsorganisation, a subsidiary of the Austrian tobacco monopoly, were at the very least misleading and incorrect, but that the said Austrian company had nevertheless undertaken until further notice not to import any South African tobacco from the Dutch firm TEIC. It should be underlined that the Austria Einkaufsorganisation had made this pledge, although neither the Anti-Apartheid Movement nor the Dutch Government nor the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) have substantiated the allegations contained in the 'tobacco report'.

"Moreover, the Committee was informed in connexion with other cases in which the Austrian tobacco monopoly was allegedly involved, that this company would refrain, until further notice, from importing any tobacco from the countries neighbouring Southern Rhodesia. This was done because tobacco imports from these countries had repeatedly given rise to doubts in the Committee as to whether they did not originate in Southern Rhodesia.

"All these decisions, taken unilaterally by the Austrian tobacco monopoly, did result in a number of economic disadvantages for this company. Aware of the need of a more systematic and general approach to this problem - which does not involve companies of one country alone - the Austrian representative in the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) had therefore requested already during the 205th meeting of the Committee on 28 August 1974 that it establish a detailed study of tobacco production and trade in southern Africa and set out clear and unequivocal guidelines on documentation necessary for the importing of tobacco from countries neighbouring Southern Rhodesia. More specifically, he requested that the Committee produce those parts of the manual - as referred to in paragraph 11 of the second special report of the Committee - dealing with tobacco trade.

"Due to a lack of time and to special circumstances in which the Committee devoted most of its time during the last four months of 1974 to the preparation of reports, this request was never taken up.

"In view of the economic consequences of this case to which I have referred above, you will understand that I would now like to request you to place this matter again before the Committee with a view of taking any action it may deem appropriate."

5. An acknowledgement was sent by the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Austria, informing him that the matter had been put before the Committee for consideration at an early opportunity and pointing out that, with regard to importations of tobacco from southern Africa, the accompanying documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 was still valid.

Case No. INGO-7. Tourism and travel to and from Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from non-Governmental sources f/

1. A cable dated 4 February 1975 was received from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, Bonn, the Federal Republic of Germany. The text of the cable is reproduced below:

"Would you kindly supply us with your definition of commercial tourism to Southern Rhodesia under the United Nations sanctions legislation. Inclusive tours continue to be marketed in this country under South African Airways and Lufthansa filing numbers. Among tourists from Common Market countries, West Germans form the largest contingent. We have interested a number of parliamentarians in this problem and would appreciate your quick response to our above request. The definition should cover inclusive tours which are openly propagated and marketed in combination with tours to South Africa. These tours are widely paid for as a package including sectors flown on Air Rhodesian guided sight-seeing tours and safaris inside Southern Rhodesia. Please cover also the arguments (a) that tour agents are handling the Southern Rhodesian portion of its tours through South African agents, and (b) that interference with tourism would imply an interference with a basic right, namely, free movement. We look forward to your reply."

2. A further cable dated 21 April 1975 was received from the Research Group, the text of which is reproduced below:

"In response to your Committee's appeal for information from private and non-governmental organizations, and with special reference to your request for information under the headings (d) and (f) of the appeal dated 4 September 1973 g/ I submit the following:

"According to reports carried in

"(1) 'TI' Nr.16/74 of 12 December 1974 published by Deutscher Verkehrs-verlag, Hamburg, and

f/ For additional information concerning this matter, see also chap. I, para. 7 and annex I of this report.

g/ See S/11178/Rev.1, paras. 62-68.

"(2) Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung of 2 February 1975, tourists from the Federal Republic of Germany now form the largest contingent of overseas tourists visiting Southern Rhodesia from western Europe, including the United Kingdom. The organizers include Marco Polo, ADAC, Neckermann, Airtours international and Isfernreisen.

"Inclusive group tours are being advertised and sold by these firms both in the current season and in the forthcoming main tourist season (outgoing). The Government was made aware of the illegality of this outgoing tourist traffic to Southern Rhodesia through parliamentary questions already in June 1974. Federal German foreign trade legislation forbids money transfers to Southern Rhodesia under clause 58 A of the foreign trade ordinance. But the ordinance leaves it at the Federal Government's discretion whether to punish violations or not. So far, the Government has not interfered with the tour organizers, apparently accepting the firms' argument that they are complying with sanctions because they are arranging and paying for the group tours through South African intermediaries.

"We trust that this information may assist your Committee in its deliberations on the subject."

3. An acknowledgement was sent to the authors of the cable.
4. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a letter dated 2 May 1975 was sent by the Acting Chairman to the Research Group. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

"I have the honour to refer to your cable dated 4 February 1975, requesting the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia to supply you with a definition of commercial tourism to Southern Rhodesia under the Security Council resolutions on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"I wish to inform you that the Committee has on a number of occasions discussed the general question of persons travelling to Southern Rhodesia either as individuals or in organized groups. In particular, the Committee has always endeavoured to ascertain whether persons doing so do not contravene the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) or the spirit of the sanctions established by the Council against the illegal régime.

"In that connexion, reference may be made to the provisions of paragraphs 4 and 6 of resolution 253 (1968) which state the following:

- '4. Decides that all States Members of the United Nations shall not make available to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or to any commercial, industrial or public utility undertaking,

including tourist enterprises, in Southern Rhodesia any funds for investment or any other financial or economic resources and shall prevent their nationals and any persons within their territories from making available to the régime or to any such undertaking any such funds or resources and from remitting any other funds to persons or bodies within Southern Rhodesia, except payments exclusively for pensions or for strictly medical, humanitarian or educational purposes or for the provision of news material and in special humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs:

'6. Decides 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'.

"It may be worthwhile to draw your attention, however, to the seventh report, adopted by the Committee on 31 December 1974 (copy attached for your convenience). In this report, chapter VI, entitled "Immigration and tourism", may be of interest to you, in particular, section C, which deals with cases connected with tourism.

"Finally, I would like to assure you that your interest in the matter of definition or commercial tourism to Southern Rhodesia is appreciated. The text of your cable has been circulated to the Committee, and I shall not fail to inform you of any further developments on this issue."

5. At the 237th and 238th meetings, the Committee considered and adopted the text of a press release regarding tourism to and from Southern Rhodesia (issued on 27 May), the text of a note to all Member States (dispatched on 3 June) and the text of a further letter to the Research Group (sent on 23 May 1975). The texts of the press release, the note and the letter are reproduced below:

Text of the press release

"The Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia has been regularly receiving information that a number of travel agencies, airline companies, car rental firms and credit-card companies in many countries are involved in organizing and providing ancillary services for promoting tourism or facilitating travel to and from Southern Rhodesia. The Committee is also aware of the increasing frequency of travel abroad by persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia on tourist or business trips, their attendance at international conferences and their participation in sports or other events abroad. h'

h/ The travel abroad by persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia falls under para. 5 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"The Committee considers that such tourist and travel activities are certainly contrary both to the spirit and letter of Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. 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. i/

"Consequently, the Committee has decided to appeal to all Member States to institute appropriate measures that might prohibit or discourage the occurrence of the above-mentioned activities within their territories; it also strongly appeals to those States 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."

Annex

In resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, the Security Council, in the following paragraphs:

"4. Decides that all States Members of the United Nations shall not make available to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or to any commercial, industrial or public utility undertaking, including tourist enterprises, in Southern Rhodesia any funds for investment or any other financial or economic resources and shall prevent their nationals and any persons within their territories from making available to the régime or to any such undertaking any such funds or resources and from remitting any other funds to persons or bodies within Southern Rhodesia, except payments exclusively for pensions or for strictly medical, humanitarian or educational purposes or for the provision of news material and in special humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs;

"5. Decides that all States Members of the United Nations shall:

"(a) Prevent the entry into their territories, save on exceptional humanitarian grounds, of any person travelling on a Southern Rhodesian passport, regardless of its date of issue, or on a purported passport issued by or on behalf of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia;

"(b) 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

i/ The organizing of tourist activity to Southern Rhodesia falls under paras. 4 to 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). See the annex to the press release for the texts of the paras. cited.

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;

"6. Decides 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".

Text of the note to all States

"In the course of the performance of its mandate, which is concerned with the supervision of the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, the Committee had received numerous reports from various sources of persons travelling to Southern Rhodesia either as individuals or in organized groups. The Committee has also heard of several instances where Member States have all too readily granted admission into their territories persons known to be ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia. Naturally, the Committee has become increasingly concerned at the possibility that such travel to and from Southern Rhodesia might contravene the provisions of the Security Council resolutions establishing sanctions against the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia.

"Consequently, at its 237th meeting, the Committee decided to issue a press communiqué on the matter, a copy of which is enclosed for ease of reference of His Excellency's Government, indicating the Committee's considered views thereon.

"At the same meeting, the Committee also decided that the matter should be brought to the particular attention of all Member States, requesting the comments that each Government might be able to make upon it and inquiring what measures, if any, the Government contemplated taking to ensure that activities facilitating such travel to or from its country are either prohibited or effectively discouraged."

Text of the letter to the Research Group

"I have the honour to refer to your cable of 4 February 1975 requesting the Committee's definition of commercial tourism, in view of the various organized tours to Southern Rhodesia that had come to your attention. In my letter to you of 10 April 1975 I informed you that the matter had been put before the Committee and that I would let you know in due course the Committee's decision upon it.

"At its 237th meeting, the Committee, following its consideration of the

matter, decided to issue a press communiqué concerning that subject, a copy of which is enclosed for your information. At the same meeting, the Committee also decided to bring the matter to the attention of all Member States as indicated in the communiqué.

"I hope that the views thus expressed by the Committee will be of assistance to you. I take this opportunity to reiterate that the Committee will continue to appreciate receiving reliable information on such tours to or from Southern Rhodesia as well as on any action that your organization may be able to undertake in connexion with any individuals, organizations or authorities in any country who might still contemplate making or facilitating such tours or permitting them to take place."

6. Acknowledgements dated 5, 6, 11, 12 and 18 June 1975 were received from El Salvador, Gabon, Malaysia, the Federal Republic of Germany and Zaire, respectively.

7. Communications were received from Kenya, Ethiopia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Thailand, the German Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Ghana, Rwanda, Afghanistan, India, Japan, the USSR, Niger, Singapore and New Zealand, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 11 June 1975 from Kenya

"By its note reference KMUN/POL/COL/2A/94, dated 3 December 1974, the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the comprehensive action taken by the Government of the Republic of Kenya as far back as December 1965, in enacting legislation prohibiting export of any goods to Southern Rhodesia or the use of stores aboard aircraft or ships dealing with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. The Government of the Republic of Kenya wishes therefore to reiterate its stand in its reply to the Secretary-General's request regarding the comments from the Government of the Republic of Kenya on measures it has taken to ensure that activities facilitating travel to or from its territory into Southern Rhodesia are prohibited and effectively discouraged."

(ii) Note dated 3 July 1975 from Ethiopia

"The Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of the Provisional Military Government of Ethiopia to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform /the Secretary-General/ that Ethiopia consistent with its obligation to abide by the Security Council resolutions establishing sanctions against the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia, does not allow any travel, whether organized or individual, to and from Southern Rhodesia."

(iii) Note dated 11 July 1975 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"1. The Federal Government permits entry into the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany to holders of Southern Rhodesian passports only on exceptional humanitarian grounds.

"In each case of an entry by a holder of another passport ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia a check is made wherever possible as to whether the person concerned supports the illegal Smith régime.

"2. The basic law (constitution) of the Federal Republic of Germany guarantees every German the right to freely leave his country at any time. This right applies also to travels to Southern Rhodesia for purposes clearly not unlawful.

"Offers by travel organizers for group travels have been examined as to whether they involve illegal payment transactions. It was established that German travel organizers neither maintain contacts with Southern Rhodesian tourist enterprises nor make payments to Southern Rhodesia.

"In isolated cases, however, German travel organizers have been found to include in their programmes the possibility of connecting trips through Southern Rhodesia offered and organized by their South African counterparts. While this is undesirable, it does not represent a violation of the embargo provisions of the Foreign Trade Ordinance. Consequently, the Federal Government is not in a position to prevent German travel organizers from continuing to offer these trips through Southern Rhodesia. Nevertheless, it has asked the organizers to drop such trips from their programmes and has received assurances that this would be done. The organizers intend to comply with the Federal Government's request as soon as current contractual agreements permit."

(iv) Note dated 15 July 1975 from Thailand

"The Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of the Permanent Mission of Thailand to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General, upon instructions from his Government, that the Government of Thailand has already taken appropriate action to deny admission and travel facilities to the residents of Southern Rhodesia, in conformity with the United Nations Security Council resolutions establishing sanctions against the rebel régime of Southern Rhodesia."

(v) Note dated 23 July 1975 from the German Democratic Republic

"With reference to the Secretary-General's note dated 3 June 1975 I have the honour to transmit to you an information of the German Democratic Republic on its observance of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council of the United Nations.

"The German Democratic Republic has always come out in favour of the implementation of resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council of the United Nations, which were passed against the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, and has itself strictly observed them. In accordance with the fundamental principles of its foreign policy, which include strict rejection of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and the policy of apartheid, as well as support for the peoples fighting for their liberation, the German Democratic Republic has at all times condemned the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and insisted on the right of self-determination for the people of Zimbabwe.

"The German Democratic Republic refuses to recognize the racist régime and rejects its claim to represent the people of Zimbabwe. The German Democratic Republic does not render any political, economic or financial assistance to the régime and does not maintain any trade, communication or other relations with it. Domestic regulations guarantee that the relevant resolutions of the United Nations are observed by all juridical and natural persons.

"Consequently, the German Democratic Republic strictly adheres to paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). There exist no relations whatsoever between the German Democratic Republic and Rhodesia in the field of tourism. Passports of the minority régime are not recognized and therefore no entry visas are granted to holders of such passports.

"In harmony with resolutions of the United Nations the German Democratic Republic does everything in its power to grant assistance and support to the people of Zimbabwe and its liberation movement."

(vi) Note dated 24 July 1975 from Pakistan

"The Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations ... with reference to the Secretary-General's note dated 3 June 1975, has the honour to submit herewith the comments of the Government of Pakistan on resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia:

'Pakistan fully supports the just aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe for self-determination and independence on the basis of majority rule. Pakistan entirely endorses the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the subject and has taken all necessary measures to implement them.

'Pakistan maintains no relations of any sort with Southern Rhodesia. A total ban has been imposed on Rhodesian aircraft as well as foreign aircraft going to and coming from Rhodesia from landing at Pakistani airports or flying over Pakistani territory. A similar ban has also been imposed on all ships carrying Rhodesia-bound cargo; their entry into Pakistani ports has been prohibited. Pakistan has also severed telecommunication and postal links with Southern Rhodesia.

Measures have been taken to ensure that no Pakistani goods find their way indirectly into Southern Rhodesia, or Rhodesian products into Pakistan. Pakistan believes that the United Nations should seek an early and effective removal of the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia, including if necessary the use of force under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter'."

(vii) Note dated 31 July 1975 from Ghana

"The Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of the Permanent Mission of Ghana to the United Nations ... has the honour to transmit the following reply received from the Government of Ghana.

Ghana has always observed, and will continue to observe, the provisions of operative paragraphs 4 and 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) banning tourism to and from Southern Rhodesia.'"

(viii) Note dated 31 July 1975 from Rwanda

"Rwanda shares the concern of the Security Council Committee regarding the violation of the resolutions mandating sanctions against the rebel régime of Ian Smith.

"The Government of Rwanda shares the keen interest of all peace-loving and justice-loving countries in the elimination of colonialism and the system of apartheid which continue to inflict their crimes on South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe.

"The Rwandese Republic condemns categorically the racist régime of South Africa and the rebel régime of Rhodesia. It also condemns all Governments and companies which continue to violate the coercive measures taken against the minority régimes and the usurpers in South Africa and South Rhodesia.

"The Government of Rwanda has never authorized and will never authorize any travel to or from these countries. It has never maintained, **nor** does it have any intention of maintaining relations either with the rebel régime of Rhodesia or with Pretoria in the spheres of military, economic or diplomatic co-operation.

"The people of Zimbabwe and the liberation movements of South Africa will have our fraternal sympathy and our total material and moral support in their struggle against alien domination and oppression until they achieve total liberation."

(ix) Note dated 7 August 1975 from Afghanistan

"The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, in line with its well-known position on the question of Southern Rhodesia, namely its support of the legitimate struggle of the people of Zimbabwe against the illegal white

minority régime of Southern Rhodesia for their right of self-determination and independence and majority rule, and because of its scrupulous observance of the sanction resolutions of the United Nations against Southern Rhodesia has not granted whatsoever admission to Afghanistan to any resident of Southern Rhodesia. No Afghan tourist organization has ever sponsored any organized travel to and from Southern Rhodesia either by individuals or by groups."

(x) Note dated 5 August 1975 from India

"It is confirmed that organized travel to and from Southern Rhodesia either by individuals or by groups is not permitted by India."

(xi) Note dated 6 August 1975 from Japan

"Taking into consideration the decision of the 237th meeting of the Security Council Committee ... the Government of Japan has taken necessary measures to ensure that tourist travel to Southern Rhodesia on a package tour basis by Japanese nationals is discouraged. The measures taken by the Government of Japan are the following:

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a note dated 7 July 1975 to the Ministry of Transportation in which it transmitted the decision of the Committee and requested the latter to take necessary measures in order that the travel agencies concerned comply with the decision of the Committee.

"The Ministry of Transportation in its note dated 16 July 1975 addressed to the Association of the International Travel Agencies drew the attention to the decision of the Committee and requested the Association to inform all its members to comply with that decision.

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its note dated 17 July 1975 drew the attention of all the local authorities, which are authorized to issue passports, to the decision of the Committee and requested their co-operation to discourage Japanese nationals from traveling as tourists on a package tour basis to Southern Rhodesia."

(xii) Note dated 25 August 1975 from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

"The position of the Soviet Union with regard to the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia is well known. It has been set out on many occasions in United Nations documents and in statements by representatives of the USSR in the Security Council and the General Assembly during the deliberations on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

"The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the racist régime of Ian Smith, all the acts of which are directed towards its domination of the people of Zimbabwe and subjecting that people to racial oppression and colonial exploitation, and it does not recognize that régime.

"Guided by its unswerving policy of extending all possible assistance and support to peoples who are fighting for their national liberation against the forces of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, the Soviet Union has consistently implemented and will continue unwaveringly to implement the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council concerning Southern Rhodesia. It has taken the necessary steps for the strict observance of the Security Council's demands with regard to the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. It maintains no relations with the racist régime of that country. This position of principle also extends to the sphere of tourism: the Soviet Union does not admit tourists from Southern Rhodesia, and Soviet citizens do not visit Southern Rhodesia for tourism or any other purpose.

"The Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations takes this opportunity to renew to the Secretary-General the assurances of its highest consideration and requests that the text of this note be circulated as a Security Council document." 1/

(xiii) Note dated 10 September 1975 from Niger

"The Permanent Representative of Niger to the United Nations ... in reply to /the Secretary-General's/ note of 3 June 1975 concerning trips to Southern Rhodesia by nationals of Member States, has the honour to confirm that the Government of Niger has never condoned or encouraged such acts. In fact, such trips have never been undertaken from the territory of Niger."

(xiv) Note dated 29 August 1975 from Singapore

"The Chargé d'affaires of Singapore to the United Nations has the honour to advise the Secretary-General of the United Nations that the Government of Singapore does not recognize Southern Rhodesian passports and therefore refuses all applications by Southern Rhodesian nationals for visas to enter Singapore."

(xv) Note dated 29 October 1975 from New Zealand

"To deal first with the question of travel by New Zealanders to Southern Rhodesia, the provisions of United Nations Security Council resolution 253 (1968) were given effect in New Zealand law by the United Nations Sanctions (Southern Rhodesia) Regulations 1968. These regulations, together with the Exchange Control Regulations 1965, prohibit both the direct and the indirect transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia except with the consent of the Minister of Finance in the former case and the Reserve Bank of New Zealand in the latter. Although the two sets of regulations do not prohibit travel to Southern Rhodesia, the fact that they deny funds to intending travellers for use there seems effectively to discourage such activities.

j/ See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1975, document S/11016.

"The New Zealand Government is constantly vigilant for possible violations of the sanctions resolutions and has previously communicated to the Secretary-General information concerning its efforts to discourage travel to Southern Rhodesia. Instances of possible breaches have been few, and in each case the New Zealand Government has fully investigated the matter to ensure that no violations occurred. In 1974, for example, the New Zealand Government investigated the activities of a travel firm to ascertain whether offences under the New Zealand legislation implementing the Security Council's resolutions had occurred. Details of this investigation were communicated to the Secretary-General in the Permanent Representative's note 2/6/17 of 18 June 1975.

"Consent to the transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia is not given unless the purpose for which permission for such a transfer is sought falls within one of the categories specifically exempted in paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). The New Zealand Government did not, for example, prevent the indirect transfer of funds in relation to the visit of a small television news gathering team to Southern Rhodesia earlier this year, noting that paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned resolution permits the remission of funds for payments for educational purposes and for the provision of news material.

"As regards travel from Southern Rhodesia, the New Zealand Government implements strictly the provisions of paragraph 5 of resolution 253 (1968) concerning travel abroad by persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia. In accordance with paragraph 5 (a) of resolution 253 (1968) no person is permitted to enter New Zealand on a passport issued in Southern Rhodesia, regardless of the date of its issue. Exceptions may be allowed only on exceptional humanitarian grounds. New Zealand citizens ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia are permitted to enter solely on the basis of their New Zealand citizenship. All air and sea carriers to New Zealand have been informed that passengers using Southern Rhodesian passports should not be booked to New Zealand unless they have prior permission to enter New Zealand under the exceptions outlined above.

"People travelling on passports of some other nationality, but known to be ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia and to be active supporters of the régime, are not permitted to enter New Zealand without the consent of the Minister of Immigration. New Zealand posts overseas are constantly vigilant against attempts by such persons to visit New Zealand."

8. A letter dated 3 November 1975 (also covering Case No. 171) was received from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, Bonn. The portion of the letter relevant to the present case is reproduced below:

"With reference to Case No. INGO-7, it has now been established through parliamentary initiatives that the Federal German sanctions legislation does not cover commercial tourism to Southern Rhodesia, provided the respective contracts are with firms in the Republic of South Africa. This, at any rate,

is the view expressed by the Ministry of Economic Affairs in the Bundestag on 18 June 1975 in an answer to questions from Dieter Schinzel, MP. As a result, several big tour operators in the Federal Republic, including the companies Dr. Tigges-Fahrten, 56 Wuppertal 1, Briller Str. 181, and Airtours International, 6 Frankfurt/Main, Gärtnerweg 4-6, are again selling inclusive tours to Southern Rhodesia in the current season. We have therefore addressed ourselves to the Foreign Office in Bonn with a letter, of which we enclose a copy for your information. k/ We are pointing out that obviously an important gap does exist in the Federal German sanctions legislation, since it allows for the circumvention of the embargo simply by using South African firms as agents for one's trade with Southern Rhodesia."

9. An acknowledgement was sent to the authors of the communication (as also indicated in (199) Case No. 171, para. 41).

10. Further to paragraph 5 above, a communication dated 28 November 1975 was received from Malta, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Malta to the United Nations ... with reference to the communication of 3 June 1975 (Case No. INGO-7) has the honour to advise that in Malta Rhodesian passports are not recognized either by the Commissioner of Police or by the Immigration Office. Consequently, persons travelling on such passports are not allowed entry into Malta."

Case No. INGO-8. Tourism, immigration and transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by the National Anti-Apartheid Committee (NAAC) of New Zealand

1. A communication dated 6 November 1974 was received from the National Anti-Apartheid Committee (NAAC) of New Zealand, giving an account of that Committee's activities relating to the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and enclosing copies of its correspondence with the relevant departments of the Government of New Zealand, a summary of which is given below:

(a) In a letter dated 26 August 1974 addressed to the Prime Minister, NAAC had urged the Government to institute an investigation into, and, if possible, a prosecution against, the Tui Cricket Club, in view of that club's reported tour of certain African countries, including Southern Rhodesia, during August and September 1974. 1'

k/ The enclosure is kept in the Secretariat files.

1' The Security Council Committee opened a case on this matter on the basis of information obtained from published sources (see S/11594/Rev.1, annex II, (171) Case No. 191).

(b) In a letter dated 5 September 1974, NAAC drew the attention of the Attorney-General to advertisements that it said had appeared in the Auckland Star (30 August 1974, p. 16) and in the New Zealand Herald (31 August 1974, p. 14) under the heading "Rhodesia Welcomes You", encouraging emigration of New Zealand nationals to Southern Rhodesia. In another letter dated 2 October 1974 addressed to the Prime Minister, NAAC demanded prohibition of such encouragement of emigration to Southern Rhodesia.

(c) In an address to the Conference on Southern Africa held in Christchurch, New Zealand, on 14 September 1974, the Chairman of NAAC mentioned the following points with regard to the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia:

- (i) The Tui Cricket Club tour of Southern Rhodesia;
- (ii) Two New Zealand insurance companies, the South British Insurance Company and the New Zealand Insurance Company, operating in Southern Rhodesia; m
- (iii) A major New Zealand travel company, DALGETY'S, said to have promoted tours to Southern Rhodesia since early 1974;
- (iv) A citizen of New Zealand, Mr. A. C. R. Elderton, living in Christchurch, said to be transferring funds to Southern Rhodesia.

(d) In letters dated 20 October 1974 addressed to the Minister of Defence and to the Minister of Police, NAAC expressed concern at a report said to have been published in The Press (1 October 1974), that the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia was recruiting Australians for its armed forces. Both ministers were requested by NAAC to undertake a full and comprehensive investigation aimed at ascertaining whether or not the illegal régime was also recruiting in New Zealand.

(e) In a letter dated 4 October 1974 addressed to the Minister of Civil Aviation, NAAC inquired whether The Hague and Montreal Conventions on hijacking and sabotage applied also to Air Rhodesia aircraft, in which case, provision of insurance on such aircraft would be rendered difficult.

(f) In a letter dated 7 October 1974, NAAC asked the Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, if the current New Zealand regulations prohibited interline agreements between Air New Zealand and Air Rhodesia, n/ all prepaid travel, including package tours, to Southern Rhodesia, and advertising or public relations activities for tourism, emigration, investment or trade with Southern Rhodesia. If not, NAAC proposed enactment or improvement of legislation to that effect.

m/ The Security Council Committee opened a case on this matter on the basis of information obtained from published sources (see S/11594/Rev.1, annex II, (176) Case No. 176).

n/ See reply dated 30 July 1974, from New Zealand reproduced in S/11594/Rev.1, annex V, Case INGO-4, para. 26 (v).

(g) In a letter of the same date addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, NAAC urged the Government to advance in the United Nations a proposal to appoint a United Nations sanctions commissioner, who would be empowered to go to any country involved in a case of suspected violation of sanctions, thereby supplementing and facilitating the work of the Security Council Committee on Sanctions.

(h) In a letter dated 29 October 1974 addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, NAAC requested information on the results of the investigations into the Tui Cricket Club's reported tour of Southern Rhodesia.

2. An acknowledgement was sent to NAAC.

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 29 April 1975 was sent to New Zealand, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has received information from the National Anti-Apartheid Committee of New Zealand, indicating the activities that Committee had undertaken in its efforts to promote the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The information contained certain reports of possible violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, which the Security Council Committee considers serious enough to warrant investigation by His Excellency's Government. It was reported that since early 1974 a major New Zealand travel company, DALGETY'S, has promoted tours to Southern Rhodesia; also that two New Zealand newspapers, the Auckland Star, 30 August 1974, and the New Zealand Herald, 31 August 1974, had carried advertisements encouraging emigration of New Zealand nationals to Southern Rhodesia. It was further reported that a citizen of New Zealand, Mr. A. C. R. Elderton, of Christchurch, New Zealand, was transferring funds to Southern Rhodesia. The above information was stated to have been drawn to the attention of the relevant departments of the Government of New Zealand in various letters from the National Anti-Apartheid Committee of New Zealand, apparently without substantive response to the points raised.

"The Security Council Committee considers that these reports, if proved, would constitute serious violations of the spirit and intent, if not the regulations, of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Accordingly, the Committee has indicated that it would greatly appreciate receiving, at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month, the Government's comments on the pertinent points raised."

4. The Government of New Zealand acknowledged receipt of the Secretary-General's note by a communication dated 23 May 1975 and subsequently sent a substantive reply dated 18 June 1975 together with supporting documentation which is described in the text of the reply.

5. The substantive part of that reply reads as follows:

"With regard to the promotion of tours to Southern Rhodesia by the firm of Dalgety Travel, in May 1974 the attention of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was drawn to material concerning "Gary Player Golfing Safaris", tours to Southern Africa which included Southern Rhodesia in the itinerary. These tours were organized by "New Zealand Tours and Travel" for which Dalgety Travel acted as a sales outlet. On 27 May the Associate Minister of Foreign Affairs wrote, on behalf of the Prime Minister, to New Zealand Tours and Travel, Air New Zealand and the Travel Agents' Association of New Zealand asking that the promotion and sales of the tours be discontinued. Copies of these letters are attached. In a letter of 10 June the Travel Agents Association of New Zealand undertook to take the matter up with the travel agents concerned and stated that the Associate Minister's request would be considered fully at the next meeting of the Executive Committee. In a letter of the same date, New Zealand Tours and Travel advised that the programme of tours had been withdrawn from sale as requested. A subsequent reference to the Associate Minister's letter in the August 'South Pacific Travel Trade News' showed that travel groups throughout New Zealand had been made aware of the implications of the Sanctions Regulations. The New Zealand Government is not aware of any other tours to Southern Rhodesia having been promoted by Dalgety Travel.

"On the question of advertisements encouraging emigration to Southern Rhodesia, while the publication of such advertisements is not illegal in New Zealand, it is regarded by the Government as being in conflict with the substance as well as the spirit of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and is contrary to the Government's policy. On 19 March 1973, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand wrote to newspaper publishers informing them of the Government's view. Copies of that letter are attached. In October 1974, the attention of the Government was drawn to the fact that further advertisements encouraging emigration to Southern Rhodesia had appeared in newspapers on 30 and 31 August 1974. At the Government's direction, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs wrote again to newspaper publishers and to the Newspaper Publishers Association of New Zealand. Copies of these letters are attached. The National Anti-Apartheid Committee was advised on several occasions of the Government's views and actions in regard to this matter. So far as the New Zealand Government is aware, no further such advertisements have appeared in newspapers published in New Zealand.

"With regard to the enquiry concerning the transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia by Mr. A. C. R. Elderton, in December 1973 the attention of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was drawn to the October issue of Rhodesian Commentary, a publication produced in Australia by supporters of the Smith régime. That issue contained a photograph of Mr. Elderton handing to Mr. Smith a donation to the Southern Rhodesian "Terrorist Victims Relief Fund".

"The photograph suggested a breach by Mr. Elderton of the United Nations Sanctions (Southern Rhodesia) Regulations 1968, and in particular of Regulation 5 (6). A copy of these regulations is attached. At the direction of the Prime Minister, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs wrote, as a first step, to seek Mr. Elderton's comments on the matter. Copies of that letter of 8 January 1974 are attached. On 19 January Mr. Elderton replied that he had given a donation of \$US 20 and some Rand. The prosecution of Mr. Elderton was considered, but not initiated for two reasons. First, investigations into the case could not be completed before the expiry of the six-month time limit applicable to prosecution under the United Nations Sanctions (Southern Rhodesia) Regulations 1968. Secondly, those investigations strongly suggested that Mr. Elderton was not a New Zealand citizen and accordingly that his action did not fall within the scope of Regulation 5 (6). On 27 November 1974 the National Anti-Apartheid Committee was informed at a meeting in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the conclusions reached in the case. The Government is not aware of any other instances in which Mr. Elderton may have transferred funds to Southern Rhodesia."

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 246th meeting, a note dated 24 September 1975 was sent to New Zealand, under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of the note is reproduced below:

"At its 246th meeting, the Committee examined the reply dated 18 June 1975 sent to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Mission of New Zealand in connexion with Case No. INGO-8.

"The Committee found it encouraging to know that the tours to Southern Rhodesia arranged by the firm Dalgety Travel had been discontinued and it expressed its appreciation for the measures which led to that result.

"Concerning the donation made by Mr. A. C. R. Elderton to the Southern Rhodesian régime, the Committee wondered whether it would be possible for His Excellency's Government to provide additional information. More specifically, it would be useful for the Committee to know the exact nationality of Mr. Elderton and, if he is not a national of New Zealand, on what passport he travelled. Also, the Committee would be grateful for any additional information on the circumstances of the donation as well as on its real amount.

"On a more general subject, the Committee read with surprise that the investigation into the case could not be completed 'before the expiration of the six-month time limit applicable to prosecution under the United Nations Sanctions (Southern Rhodesian) Regulations 1968'. The Committee noted that, as it appears from a number of cases on the Committee's rolls, judicial actions of that nature often take a rather lengthy time. The Committee therefore expressed its concern that such a short time-limitation may regrettably hinder the efficient prosecution of sanctions violators; accordingly, it felt it its duty also to draw the attention of the Government to that particular matter and request its views on it.

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

7. A reply dated 24 November 1975 was received from New Zealand, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The New Zealand authorities, after conducting extensive inquiries, have confirmed that although Mr. Elderton has resided in New Zealand since 1957, he is not a New Zealand citizen and does not hold a New Zealand passport. Since Mr. Elderton is of Irish parentage, it is possible that he travels on an Irish passport.

"As regards the donation reported to have been made by Mr. Elderton, the New Zealand authorities' understanding from the article which appeared in the 'Rhodesian Commentary' and from comments made by Mr. Elderton is that the donation was made on behalf of the Southern Africa Friends Society and that it was made up of funds obtained in South Africa. So far as the amount of the donation is concerned, the New Zealand authorities are unable to add anything to the advice conveyed to the Secretary-General on 18 June 1975.

"On the point raised by the Sanctions Committee concerning the six-month time limit applicable to prosecution under the United Nations Sanctions (Southern Rhodesia) Regulations 1968, the New Zealand authorities have observed that it is normal under New Zealand law to impose a six-month time limit on the laying of an information for summary offenses. In the light of the Committee's comments, however, the New Zealand authorities are examining the relevant New Zealand legislation."

Case No. INGO-9. Cargo Air Transport: information supplied by the Comité contre le colonialisme et l'apartheid (Belgium)

1. A communication dated 15 May 1975, addressed to the Chairman of the Committee was received from Mr. P. Pierson-Mathy, a member of the Comité contre le colonialisme et l'apartheid, Brussels, Belgium. The text of the communication including two annexes is reproduced below.

Letter from Mrs. P. Pierson-Mathy,
Comité contre le colonialisme et l'apartheid

We would like to draw the U.N. Committee on Sanction's attention on a new Belgian Air Line Company "CARGO AIR TRANSPORT" (C.A.T.) which is most probably financed by the illegal régime of Rhodesia.

This company has requested rights to operate from Bruxelles and the Belgian Ministry of Communication was suppose to take a decision this week about it.

You will find enclosed:

- 1) The information in our possession about the air line company.
- 2) Copy of a telegram we sent to 3 members of the government and to the head of the most influential political party actually in power.

We will continue our action in order to prevent C.A.T. to get the necessary o.k for take off and will let you know about the results.

Annex I

Telegram dated 14 May 1975, Brussels (Belgium)

"Comité belge contre colonialisme et apartheid draws urgent attention Belgian Government to new Belgian air transport company Cargo Air Transport (CAT) which has requested take-off rights Brussels airport.

"Reliable information sources indicate that CAT is financed by illegal Rhodesian régime.

"Board of Directors includes former mercenaries and representative of armaments company.

"CAT has ties with Rhodesian company Air Transport Africa and the Affretair company, both illegally engaged in air traffic to Rhodesia.

"DC-8 55F, registration No. 49056, aircraft serial No. 45805. leased to CAT by Aerolease Company, will provide transport to illegal Rhodesian régime in violation of international sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

"Comité urgently requests Belgian Government to refuse CAT authorization for take-off and to investigate CAT.

"Information on CAT already in possession OAU will be transmitted to United Nations Sanctions Committee.

"Highest consideration.

"For Comité
"P. PIERSON-MATHY

"Copies to:

Mr. Tindemans, Prime Minister
Mr. Martens, President, Christelijke Volkspartij
Mr. Van Elslande, Minister for Foreign Affairs
Mr. Chabert, Minister of Communications"

Annex II o/

Information on company "Cargo Air Transport" (CAT)

"A new company was established in Belgium, Cargo Air Transport (CAT), headquarters at 453 Avenue Louise, Brussels, on 15 April 1975, before the notary Mr. Hans Berquin. The capital of the company amounts to 50 million Belgian francs paid on 1 May, consisting of 1,000 shares of 50,000 Belgian francs each.

"(1) Investco (Antwerp branch of Kredietbank), with 70 per cent of the shares, is not represented on the Board of Directors.

"(2) Société Epasil (Liechtenstein, 12 July 1974) - 27.5 per cent of the shares.

"(3) Exocet, Matra military equipment (Paris, 8 April 1974), the director of which is Mr. Claude Milan, owns 0.50 per cent of the shares in the name of Claude Milan.

"(4) Mr. Claude Milan, 10, rue de Florence, Paris 8, owns 0.5 per cent of the shares.

"(5) Mr. Roger Gilson, President of CAT, 15 avenue M. Pech, Watermael-Boitsfort (Belgium), owns 0.5 per cent.

"(6) Mr. Bernard Barberon, 453 avenue Louise and 52, rue du Progrès, Brussels. Managing Director, owns 0.50 per cent. French. Telephone: 704.88.78. Affretair agent in Belgium.

"(7) Mr. Roland Dumont de Chassart, 28 rue de l'Eglise, Ohain (Belgium). Owns 0.5 per cent. Business agent.

Transport officer Marcel Tinnemans, Strombeek-Bever, Belgium.

"There is an aircraft company in Rhodesia called Air Trans Africa. This company owns two Boeing 720 aircraft of Scandinavian origin which were delivered by Switzerland and Portugal two years ago.

"ATA cannot operate in Africa. Claude Milan established a company called Affretair Cie Gabonaise d'affrètement, at Libreville, Gabon, with headquarters at Libreville.

"Affretair had been operating out of London but encountered problems regarding fuel and insurance, for the British have understood the situation.

o/ As subsequently amended by the Belgian Committee in M. Pierson-Mathy's letter of 21 June 1975 (see para. 7 of this case).

"They operated from Europe to Libreville, loading the Affretair DC-6, which took off at night for Salisbury from a quiet runway. This was discovered and they are trying to weave a network of companies in Europe so that they will not be detected again.

"Claude Milan has just established the Aerolease company, which has its office in Luxembourg. This company purportedly owns or leases a DC-6 F aircraft, registration No. 49056, aircraft serial No. 45 805. The aircraft is currently at Honolulu.

"Aerolease will lease or sublease to CAT in Brussels. CAT will pay Aerolease \$87,500 monthly for seven years.

"Why is CAT not the owner?

"To prevent the aircraft from being seized by the Belgians or by anyone else.

"Claude Milan is a businessman, the general agent for Affretair, and the key man for Rhodesia.

"There is a danger that he may be granted take-off rights from Brussels unless pressure is exerted to compel the Belgian authorities to investigate the company.

"They already have a hangar at the Brussels airport with cases ready to leave for Africa."

2. An acknowledgement was sent to the suppliers of the information on 2 June 1975.

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 241st meeting, the Secretariat sent a telegram dated 20 June 1975 to the Comité contre le colonialisme et l'apartheid, asking whether it would have any objection to the transmittal of the full text of its communication dated 15 May 1975 and also inquiring whether the aircraft in question was a DC-6 or a DC-8.

4. The following reply, dated 21 June, was received from the Belgian Committee.

"Re your telegram of 20 June, we draw attention to our letter of 13 June informing you of Belgian Government's decisions not to grant license to CAT. Letter follows."

5. The letter of 13 June 1975 mentioned in the above telegram was received by the Secretariat on 23 June 1975 and reads as follows:

"We are pleased to inform you that the Belgian Government, alerted by our Committee, has refused to grant Cargo Air Transport the licenses required in order to operate out of Brussels airport.

"The Cargo Air Transport aircraft left Belgium on 27 May for Amsterdam under the registration T.R. (which stands for Gabon) L.V.K., where it was taken over again by the AFFRETAIR company.

"The aircraft apparently turns four flights a week from Amsterdam to Libreville."

6. In addition, the following letter, addressed to the Secretary-General and dated 24 June 1975, was received from the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations:

"A Belgian newspaper printed in Dutch, the Gazet van Antwerpen, recently reported the formation in Belgium of a new airline company, Cargo Air Transport (CAT).

"It seems that CAT planned to operate flights from Brussels to Rhodesia.

"On the basis of this information the Belgium Government immediately instituted an inquiry and compiled a dossier.

"As a result of action by the Belgian authorities, Cargo Air Transport abandoned its plan to request registration on being informed that registration, even on a provisional basis for a DC 8-55F aircraft, would not be granted.

"As I recall, a Belgian national, Mrs. Pierson-Mathy, a member of the Belgian Comité contre le Colonialisme et l'apartheid, has sent you correspondence concerning this matter and has also supply me with a copy of this correspondence.

"I leave it to you to consider the contents of that correspondence in the light of the latest developments, which I have the honour to communicate to you herewith."

7. A further communication dated 21 June 1975 was received from the Comité contre le colonialisme et l'apartheid:

"We acknowledge receipt of your telegram of 20 June. We presume that in the meanwhile you have received our letter of the 13th, a copy of which is enclosed to be used as you see fit.

"In reply to the questions in your telegram, we wish to inform you that the aircraft was a DC 6.

"We have nothing against the possible publication of the document and its transmission to the Belgian Government but in either case would ask you, of course, to delete opinions of individuals that might give rise to complaints from them.

"We therefore enclose the text as amended by the deletion of the words we should like to see deleted on pages 1 and 2."

8. At the 241st meeting on 19 June 1975, the representative of the United States informed the Committee that his Government would carry out investigations in connexion with the information that a DC-8 aircraft had been serviced in Honolulu.

9. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 245th meeting, notes dated 4 September 1975 were sent to Belgium and Gabon and 5 September 1975 to the Netherlands under the no-objection procedure. In the case of Gabon and the Netherlands, annex II of the original communication from the Belgian Committee was also attached. The substantive parts of the notes are reproduced below:

Note to Belgium

"The Committee has seen the letter dated 24 June 1975 from the Permanent Representative of Belgium addressed to the Secretary-General concerning the company named Cargo Air Transport and has noted with satisfaction the measures taken by the Belgian Government with respect to that company. However, the Committee, having been informed that agents of that company have not abandoned their efforts to establish air links with Southern Rhodesia, has requested the Secretary-General to ask His Excellency's Government to remain vigilant and keep the matter under review."

Note to Gabon and the Netherlands

"The Committee has received from the Comité contre le colonialisme et l'apartheid (Belgium) information regarding the establishment of an air transport company, Cargo Air Transport (CAT) (453 avenue Louise, Brussels), whose objective allegedly is to undertake commercial transport to Southern Rhodesia in violation of the sanctions established by the Security Council.

"The Government of Belgium, when informed of the matter, voluntarily reported to the Committee that, following intervention by the Belgian authorities, the company had abandoned its plan to request registration, which it knew would not be granted.

"Since then, according to the latest information received, the company's aircraft, a DC-6, took off on 27 May 1975 from Brussels under registration TRLVK for Amsterdam, where control over the aircraft purportedly was assumed by the Affretair company. The aircraft is now alleged to be making four flights weekly to Libreville.

"The Committee would be most grateful if the Government of _____ would send it a report on the matter, as well as any recent information on the activities of Affretair, which has already been mentioned in connexion with Case No 154 (Tango Romeo) and also appears to be directly implicated in this new case, as is indicated by the contents of the annex hereto transmitted by the Belgian non-governmental organization in question.

"The Committee, although fully aware of the efforts undertaken by the Government of _____ to ensure compliance with the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council, nevertheless wishes to reiterate the importance which it attaches to ensuring that the repeated attempts to establish commercial service between Europe and Southern Rhodesia are completely foiled. It therefore requests His Excellency's Government to repeat, and if necessary intensify, the measures already taken to that end and to keep under special surveillance the activities of Affretair. The Committee thanks the Government of _____ in advance for its comments and information on this matter, which the Committee hopes will be transmitted to it as soon as possible, preferably within one month."

10. At the 250th meeting on 2 October 1975, the representative of the United States made a statement, the text of which is reproduced below:

"At our meeting of 19 June, my Government was requested to provide information pertaining to an allegation that a DC-8 aircraft, Registration number 49056, Serial number 45805, was serviced in Honolulu. At that time, my delegation indicated its willingness to pursue the matter. I am now able to report, following investigations by appropriate authorities in Washington, that the aircraft in question was not at that time, before, or since, in Hawaii."

11. A first reminder was sent to Gabon and the Netherlands on 13 November 1975.

12. A reply dated 10 December 1975 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent aviation authorities do not know an air transport company called CARGO Air Transport (CAT) as mentioned in the Secretary-General's note dated 5 September 1975. However, they do know that the company Affretair has at its disposal a DC-8-55 G (not a DC-6 as stated in the Secretary-General's note) with registration TRLVK. This plane has been in use by Affretair for flights from and to the Netherlands since 12 July last. A DC-8 with registration TRLQR has been used considerably longer for the same purpose.

"Complying with the request of the Committee (established in accordance with Security Council Resolution 253 (1968)) as formulated in the fifth paragraph of the Secretary-General's note of 5 September, a survey is given below of the number of flights from and to the Netherlands during the period 1 January - 1 October, 1975:

Netherlands - Gabon	67
Netherlands - Nigeria	14
Netherlands - South Africa	4
Spain - Netherlands	2
Gabon - Netherlands	5
Ivory Coast - Netherlands	19

Furthermore, two additional flights were carried out under orders of Air-India.

"The goods which were transported from the Netherlands to Gabon were for the greater part destined for South Africa.

"So far sources (applications, bills of lading, etc.) have not indicated that goods from the Netherlands were transited via Gabon to Southern Rhodesia.

"Finally, the Netherlands Government wishes to reiterate that it is fully aware of the importance that no commercial contacts between Europe and Southern Rhodesia be established. The Netherlands Government's policy is to ensure compliance both in letter and in spirit with the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council."

Case No. INGO-10. Package tours to Southern Rhodesia and landing rights to airlines flying to Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by Ms. Barbara Rogers p/

1. A communication dated 2 September 1975 was received from an individual, Ms. Barbara Rogers, of New York, New York, USA. The text of that communication is reproduced below:

"I am submitting for the attention of the Committee on Sanctions some documentary evidence of continuing collaboration by travel companies of various nationalities with Air Rhodesia, in spite of action taken by the Committee and by IATA last year; and the granting of landing rights by two states to an airline flying direct to Salisbury, which is a violation of the sanctions resolutions. The cases are as follows.

"Enclosure (a) is a brochure of the World Expeditionary Association, which is based in the United Kingdom; this lists charter flights to Southern Rhodesia as among the services offered to its members. These are flights M 148 and M 149, the latter every two weeks, mentioned on page xii of the brochure. Since these are not actually charter flights, but block bookings on scheduled flights, it would seem likely that this involves the South African Airways flights SA 225 and SA 229 to Salisbury, and flights SA 224 and SA 228 from Salisbury, as mentioned below.

p/ Ms. Barbara Rogers is a collaborator with the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, Bonn. That group has supplied certain information to the Committee on the basis of which the Committee has opened or further dealt with a number of cases, e.g. Case Nos. 171 and INGO-7. She also collaborated with the Rev. Donald Morton in providing information on the basis of which the Committee opened Case No. INGO-4.

"Enclosure (b) is a copy of some pages from The Travel Agent of 1 September 1975. These concern (1) a series of package tours which include visits to Southern Rhodesian tourist areas - Victoria Falls, Salisbury, Chobe and Wankie National Park - organised by the United States company Travelworld and the Belgian national airline, Sabena. The tours also include a number of independent African countries. A second report (2) concerns a similar operation by Four Winds Travel of the United States and Air France. Their 'Kilimanjaro Safari' includes a night at Victoria Falls, Southern Rhodesia.

"Enclosure (c) consists of pages from the ABC World Airways Guide, published monthly by ABC Travel Guides Ltd., Oldhill, London Road, Dunstable, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom. As can be seen from the enclosed pages, ABC is printing advertisements placed by Air Rhodesia for its various services. Obviously, these advertisements bring in sufficient business to justify their placement. The question may be asked whether ABC Travel Guides is violating sanctions by accepting payment from Air Rhodesia and promoting their business overseas.

"Enclosure (d) is a similar selection of pages from the O.A.G. (Official Airline Guide), which is published by Reuben H. Donnelley, 2000 Clearwater Drive, Oak Brook, Illinois 60521. Advertisements for Air Rhodesia, with information on how to make reservations on the airline, are printed here in the same way as in the ABC World Airways Guide.

"Finally, I enclose further pages from the Official Airline Guide which give details of direct flights from Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia to London and Paris, operated by South African Airways. The granting of landing rights by the Governments of the United Kingdom and France for direct flights to Southern Rhodesia appears to be in violation of their sanctions obligations. As shown on page T-170, enclosure (e), SAA flights SA 225 and SA 229 leave London at 1815 on Tuesdays and Thursdays respectively for Salisbury, while flights SA 224 and SA 228 leave Salisbury at 2035 on Mondays and Wednesdays respectively for London. Flight SA 253 leaves Paris at 1820 on Mondays for Salisbury, and SA 252 leaves Salisbury for Paris at 1930 on Sundays. The enclosed pages also indicate a considerable number of direct South African Airways flights to and from Salisbury, Bulawayo and Victoria Falls, all in Southern Rhodesia.

"I hope the information as presented here is useful to the Committee in calling attention to the apparent violations of sanctions involved here. Please inform me if the Committee needs any supplementary information."

2. An acknowledgement was sent to the supplier of the information.
3. At the 250th meeting on 2 October 1975, the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States made statements to the Committee as follows:

The representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that the enclosures submitted with Ms. Rogers' letter, together with the communication itself,

had been transmitted to the appropriate authorities of the United Kingdom Government. With regard to enclosure (a), it was not clear whether WEXAS, in providing the information concerning the two scheduled flights from Heathrow to Salisbury, was acting as a travel agent and whether, in publishing its 1975-1976 travel programme, the information it had provided regarding flights to Southern Rhodesia constituted a violation of the sanctions and was actionable under English law. Of course, the publication of such information was deplorable, but it might not technically constitute a violation. Ms. Rogers had also transmitted to the Committee two reference guides for travel agents containing, inter alia, information on flights to Southern Rhodesia. The companies producing such reference guides no doubt intended them to be as complete as possible and therefore included information concerning flights by Air Rhodesia as well as other State-owned airlines. In the last paragraph of her communication, Ms. Rogers seemed to be implying that regularly scheduled flights to South Africa which called at Salisbury en route were "apparent violations of sanctions". A number of members of the Committee would not regard such flights as being in violation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). It would appear that Ms. Rogers had been mistaken on certain matters of fact.

The representative of the United States informed the Committee that his Government was actively investigating the matters referred to in the communication, and hoped to be able to produce some results.

4. At the 252nd meeting on 16 October 1975, the representatives of the United States, France and the United Kingdom made statements to the Committee as follows:

The representative of the United States informed the Committee again that his Government was actively looking into the matter and would provide the Committee with information as soon as it was available.

The representative of France said that his delegation would not make a reply on the subject of the stop made by South African Airways at Salisbury on its flights from Paris. That point would be thoroughly considered when the Committee took up the various recommendations concerning the expansion of sanctions. His delegation would then make a statement on the subject. q/ With regard to the tourist flights, as he had stated at earlier meetings, his Government had immediately approached Air France. The airline had acknowledged that there was a tour called "Kilimanjaro Safari" which had been arranged by its New York agency in co-operation with local agencies. Air France's part in the Kilimanjaro Safari programme was confined to flying passengers as far as Nairobi, the rest of the journey being organized by local companies. Nevertheless, Air France had immediately telegraphed its New York agency requesting it to comply scrupulously with the Security Council resolution and the airline had asked its representative to be particularly careful in that connexion. Since then, the local New York agency had told his delegation that the information which had prompted the action

q/ See chap. I, paras. 7 and 20 and annex I of this report as well as document S/11913.

by Air France headquarters in Paris was wrong. There was no mention of Southern Rhodesia in the "Kilimanjaro Safari" leaflet and no provision was made for crossing the Southern Rhodesian border at any point in the tour. According to the Air France agency in New York, there was only a one-night stop-over in Zambia on the other side of the Zambezi from which the Victoria Falls could be seen, and that explained the reference in annex B (2) to "one night in Victoria Falls".

The representative of the United Kingdom said that his Government had carried out a preliminary investigation concerning the flights offered by the World Expeditionary Association and the ABC World Airways Guide. Both firms denied that they had received funds from Southern Rhodesia, that they were arranging tours in that country or that they had accepted advertisements in that connexion. However, his Government was proceeding to investigate the financial position of the firms concerned to make sure that there had been no breach of exchange control regulations associated with sanctions legislation. That investigation would require further time.

5. At the same meeting, the Committee adopted the text of the note to Belgium, which was dispatched on 22 October 1975, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has received information from non-governmental sources to the effect that Sabena Airlines, a Belgian company, is working with Travelworld, a company located in Los Angeles (USA), on a series of tour packages to various parts of Africa, including Southern Rhodesia. In this connexion, the Committee would like to draw the attention of His Excellency's Government to an article from the Travel Agent of 1 September 1975, a copy of which is herewith attached.

"The Committee, which considers that package tours to Southern Rhodesia are in violation of the sanctions established by the Security Council has 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."

6. At the 254th meeting on 13 November 1975, the representative of the United States of America informed the Committee that, after careful review of the material provided in the communication from Ms. Barbara Rogers, his Government had concluded that the activities described could be in violation of United States sanctions regulations. The booking on so-called "package tours", which included stop-overs in Southern Rhodesia, could constitute a violation of operative paragraphs 3 (d), 4 or 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and of relevant implementing provisions of United States Executive Order 11419. Any use of Air Rhodesia for any portion of the tour would clearly be a violation. The purchases of overnight lodging and other tourist services advertised for the package tours would constitute a violation of United States sanction regulations unless a specific Department of the Treasury licence was obtained. The United States Government was continuing to investigate the case carefully and would take appropriate legal measures if in fact a violation had occurred. It would also continue to monitor carefully other such activities.

Case No. INGO-11. Tour to Southern Rhodesia organized by a United Kingdom travel agency: information supplied by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), British Section, London

1. In October 1975, the Office of Public Information of the United Nations transmitted to the Committee a letter dated 31 July 1975 from the British Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. The letter had been passed on by its recipient, Ms. Mary Homaday of Red Bank, New Jersey, USA. It contained information to the effect that Ian Allan Travel, a travel agency in the United Kingdom was offering a special tour to southern Africa, including a visit to Victoria Falls and Wankie Safari Lodge in Southern Rhodesia. To the letter was also attached a photo-copy of an advertisement to that effect that had appeared in the Railway World. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

"In answer to your recent request for information on breaches of sanctions on Rhodesia I have been asked by WILPF Parliamentary Committee to send you the enclosed information.

"You will see that Ian Allan Travel are offering a trip to the Victoria Falls and Wankie in Rhodesia using of course Rhodesia Railways. My husband John Harding has not received a reply to his letter of the 29 June; so could you please take this matter up with the Security Council Committee so that this violation can be stopped.

Text of the letter dated 29 June 1975 from Mr. John Harding to the Ian Allan Travel Agency

"As a subscriber to Railway World, I was surprised to see on page 304 of the July 1975 issue that you are promoting tourism to Rhodesia in a rail tour later this year.

"You may not be aware that this is an infringement of United Nations mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia which have been endorsed by our Government, and I would seek your assurance that this part of the tour will be cancelled forthwith.

"I look forward to your reply."

2. An acknowledgement was sent to the suppliers of the information.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 29 October 1975 was sent to the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Committee has received information from the British Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom to the effect that a travel company by the name of Ian Allan Travel, Shepperton, Middlesex has advertised a tour to southern Africa, which includes Victoria Falls and Wankie Safari Lodge, both in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee felt that the attention of His Excellency's Government should be drawn to the fact that this tour, including as it does a visit to Southern Rhodesia would be contrary to the spirit and intent of sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council, in particular resolution 253 (1968), and may, furthermore, be in violation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council on the matter.

"In requesting the Secretary-General to inform the Government of the United Kingdom of this possible case of sanctions violation, the Committee indicated also that it would appreciate receiving any comments His Excellency's Government might wish to make on the matter at its earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

Case No. INGO-12. Trading activities and other relations with Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by the Mouvement contre le racisme, l'antisémitisme et pour la paix, Paris

1. A communication dated 17 June 1975, together with a number of enclosures, was received from Mr. Albert Levy, Secretary-General of the Mouvement contre le racisme, l'antisémitisme et pour la paix, Paris. The texts of the communication and one of the enclosures relating to the work of the Committee on Sanctions are communicated below.

"At the request of Miss Barbara Rogers, we are sending you herewith some documentation on the recent action taken by our Mouvement against apartheid and colonialism in southern Africa.

"If you wish, we shall put you on the regular mailing list of our magazine Droit et Liberté (Right and Freedom) in order that you may be informed both about our initiatives and about the difficulties we face."

France and Rhodesia

August 1974

In addition to information already released by Dutch AABN (Zephyr report) involving the French firms: SCAC, Saint Gobain Desjonguères, Lancôme and Banque Scalbert; and in addition to older revelations concerning Boussac, available sources allow the following conclusions:

- Peugeot Automobiles operate a car assembly directly in Rhodesia.
- Aluminium Français (Pechiney) operates works at Salisbury and Bulawayo.

- Panhard, manufacturers of armoured vehicles AML, sold several vehicles to Smith's Forces in the last months of 1973. The deal was concluded through Austral Engineering Works (Pty) Ltd. in Germiston, Tvl, South Africa, who assemble the weapons under French licences from Panhard and DTAT (i.e. the French Defense Ministry).
- Alouette helicopters equipping Rhodesian Army are manufactured in France by Sud-Aviation (SNIAS, owned by French State) and are transported to Rhodesia in Cargo Airlines operated by French Line UTA.
- In Le Monde - 10 June 1974, Philippe Decraene writes that Diesel locomotives built in France were sold to Rhodesian Railways and transited via Beira. In this article, the author adds that France and Italy buy wood and meat from Rhodesia.
- The French Public Bank, Société Générale was one of the financial heads behind the secret loans for the construction of an Austrian steel plant in Rhodesia.
- In the 1974 edition of the statistical handbook issued by Direction des Douanes, the following figures on Franco-Rhodesian trade are listed in million francs:

	<u>France imports</u>	<u>France exports</u>
1972	104	2
1973	0 (1)	2

- The following French based firms are listed in official trade publications conducting import and export business with Rhodesia:

Compagnie de l'Est Asiatic (Danish): 39 Avenue d'Iéna Paris 16ème
 Keroul: 24 place Saint Jean 77000 Melun
 Kiefe: 22-24, rue Saint Georges Paris 9ème
 Moussafir: 37, rue d'Enghien Paris 10 (dealers in arms among other things)

- The following firms advertise holidays in Rhodesia:

Touring Club de France: 65 avenue de la Grande Armée Paris 16ème
 Le Tourisme Français: 50 rue de Chateaudun Paris 9ème

- Other relations:

In May 1971, the official French rugby team played against an all white Rhodesian side in Salisbury.

Chambre Syndicale Nationale des Représentants de l'Industrie et du Commerce (109 rue de Garibaldi 69006 Lyon) went on a mission in January 1971 to Rhodesia.

In January 1973, l'Association Nationale des étudiants en médecine (30, rue Grégoire de Tour 75006 Paris) offered training programmes.

For five years, a RHODESIAN INFORMATION OFFICE has been in full operation in Paris (110, rue de La Boétie, Paris 8, tél: 559 61 20). Three of the staff are known to us: Monsieur Charles Pollet (probably Frenchman), Mr. Williams and Mr. Fogarty (Rhodesians or Englishmen). The office co-ordinates trade between the two countries, supplies any information requested, supplies Rhodesian travel and immigration documents and works closely with the pro-racist French press: AGEFI (which just put out a luxurious 48-page brochure on Rhodesia in French), daily Nouveau Journal, Revue Française pour l'élite européenne (which had put out a special issue on Rhodesia) etc. The office staff knows that their office and activities are prohibited under United Nations resolutions but admits that with the French Government "no need to worry". Ch. Pollet is the editor of a monthly newsletter in French: Rhodesian Newsletter.

2. In acknowledging receipt of this communication, the Secretariat considered it necessary to request the writer to specify the source of the document entitled "France and Rhodesia 1974".

3. A communication dated 3 July 1975 was received from the Secretary-General of the Mouvement contre le racisme, l'antisémitisme et pour la paix. The relevant passage of the communication reads as follows:

"In reply to your inquiry, we would inform you that the text entitled 'France and Rhodesia' is not an article, but a note prepared by a member of the Mouvement."

4. At the 244th meeting on 17 July 1975, the representative of France informed the Committee that his delegation had taken note of the communication and would keep the Committee informed on the results of the inquiry on the various points raised in the communication. However, he wished to point out that the communication was almost a year old and dealt with events which had taken place between 1971 and 1974. The majority of the cases referred to were well known to the Committee. Indeed, the reply to the question concerning the transaction involving gold and gold alloys was to be found in the sixth report of the Committee to the Security Council (S/11178/Rev.1, para. 48). The other points raised in that communication had been dealt with at previous meetings.

5. At the same meeting the Committee decided that a case should be opened on the matter so that further inquiries could be made in that connexion.

6. A first reminder was sent to France on 15 December 1975.

Annex 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)

As indicated in paragraph 66 of the present report, the following are the substantive parts of replies received from Governments since the submission of the last report.

GREECE

"The discrepancies observed between quantities of certain commodities reported to have been imported from South Africa, Mozambique and Angola and the quantities reported to have been exported by those countries, can be explained by the fact that statistical data usually vary from one country to another.

"These discrepancies may also be attributed to the fact that in quite a few cases a period of several months elapses between the loading and expedition of the merchandise and the arrival to its destination. As an example it is cited that a quantity of amianthus of South African origin, loaded in 1970, arrived in Greece in 1971."

MALAYSIA

"Since 21 October 1969, trade relationship between Malaysia and Southern Rhodesia has ceased to exist, because on that date the Malaysian Government issued two orders prohibiting the exportation of goods to Southern Rhodesia and the importation of goods therefrom.

"These orders are:

"(i) The customs (prohibition of exports, Southern Rhodesian) order 1969, in which the following provision is made:

'Notwithstanding the provisions of any other written laws the exportation from the Federation of all or any territory administered by Southern Rhodesia is hereby absolutely prohibited.

'P.U.(A) 425/1969, as amended by P.U.(A) 462/1969.'

"(ii) The customs (prohibition of imports) order 1969, in which it is enacted that:

'The importation into the Federation or any part thereof of all goods specified in the second column of the first schedule hereto originating or manufactured wholly or mainly in or consigned from the countries shown in the third column of the said schedule is hereby absolutely prohibited.

'In the first schedule Southern Rhodesia or any territory administered by Southern Rhodesia is named as one of the countries from which importation of all goods is prohibited - P.U.(A) 426/1969.'

MEXICO

"The Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note dated 5 September 1974 concerning some discrepancies (appearing in annex V of the fifth report of the Security Council Committee established ...) between the quantities of chrome ore and asbestos reported to have been imported from South Africa and the quantities of those commodities reported to have been exported by South Africa.

"In that connexion, the Permanent Representative of Mexico wishes to state that the aforementioned discrepancies could be due to the following reasons, inter alia:

- "(i) Orders placed in a given year, for example, 1965, were filled the following year, or some of the purchased goods arrived one year and the remainder the following year;
- "(ii) The c.i.f. figure is used in recording Mexico's import statistics;
- "(iii) Changes may have occurred in the routing of shipments, since it is not unusual for goods leaving country A (in this case, South Africa) for country B (Mexico) to be diverted to a third country for reasons of trade which may arise while the goods are en route.
- "(iv) The discrepancies could also be due to the fact that the purchases were made through intermediaries."

TURKEY

"(1) Turkey has consistently complied with the resolutions of the United Nations concerning the questions of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa.

"(2) The Government of Turkey has no political, diplomatic and consular relations with Southern Rhodesia and South Africa in general and has banned all trade and economic relations with Southern Rhodesia in particular.

"The Government of Turkey is taking steps to discourage particularly private importers from importing South African asbestos and suggests that they import it from other countries.

"Due to the fact that there is no trade agreement between Turkey and South Africa and that both countries are members of GATT, the Turkish authorities have not been in a position to request certificates of origin from exporters. However, there are other measures strictly implemented to check imports from South Africa, such as the documents required under Turkish Customs Law and related provisions, which contain the necessary information to ensure the origin of imported products. These documents are: customs entrance declaration, provisional acceptance declaration, original invoice, transit declaration, transshipment declaration, import permit, price acceptance document, foreign exchange registration, documents issued by the Foreign Exchange Office, related reports, health certificates, acceptance document on health control.

"With regard to the discrepancies noted by the Security Council Committee between the quantities of commodities imported from South Africa, the Turkish Government would like to make the following corrections:

"(a) Turkey did not import asbestos from South Africa in 1965;

"(b) Only 764 tons of asbestos were imported to Turkey in 1971;

"(c) Consequently, the competent Turkish authorities assume that the 1,000 tons of asbestos reported to have been imported in 1965, and the remaining part of the 2,200 tons of asbestos reported to have been imported in 1971 to Turkey, must have been sent to other countries through a 'switch' en route."

Annex VII

NOTE AND STATISTICAL DATA PREPARED BY THE SECRETARIAT ON SOUTHERN RHODESIAN TRADE FOR 1974*

Southern Rhodesian exports

1. Southern Rhodesia's merchandise exports in 1974 were estimated to be \$600 million a/ (compared with \$625 million in 1973). The 70 odd countries whose import statistics are set out in appendix I show that Southern Rhodesian exports to them were distributed as follows: Malawi \$24 million, United States \$19 million, Zambia \$12 million, Switzerland \$7 million, other countries (shown in appendix I) \$1 million, making a total of about \$64 million (compared with \$72 million in 1973). In addition to this recorded trade, it has been estimated that South Africa, together with Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland, b/ received Southern Rhodesian exports amounting to about \$250 million. It would appear, therefore, that some \$290 million of Southern Rhodesian exports have not been reflected in the corresponding 1974 import figures of world trade. This amount of exports appears to have reached world markets via Southern Rhodesia's neighbouring countries and most of them have been reflected in world trade as imports of the reporting countries from these neighbouring countries.

* Certain figures given in the tables contained in this annex have been changed from those appearing in the seventh report in order to conform with the most recent data.

a/ Up to 1972, Southern Rhodesia published figures for total exports and imports without analysis by either commodities or direction of trade. Beginning in 1973, however, Southern Rhodesia even suppressed publication of total trade figures. In the April 1974 issue of the Economic Survey of Rhodesia published by the Ministry of Finance, the following note is carried immediately after the Contents:

"It is regretted that because of the United Nations' intensification of hostility towards Rhodesia and the consequent use to which certain statistical data can be put, it has been necessary to limit the amount of detail given in both the narrative and the tables to Survey."

b/ South Africa, Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland and Namibia constitute the Customs Union of Southern Africa, hereinafter referred to as S. Africa Customs Union.

2. Evidence of the existence of these indirect exports is shown by a comparison of imports of 23 reporting countries c/ from S. Africa Customs Union, Mozambique, Zambia and Malawi, with the corresponding exports of these four countries for the period 1965-1974. The results are shown in table 1.

3. It will be noted from the data shown in table 1 that in 1965 there was a discrepancy of \$73 million, representing imports received from S. Africa Customs Union and Mozambique by the 23 reporting countries over and above the exports that Mozambique and S. Africa Customs Union declared to have sent. These imports were generally known as shipments dispatched overseas by exporters in S. Africa Customs Union and Mozambique, handling merchandise of the former Federation of Rhodesia, which were treated as goods in transit by them but were treated as imports from Mozambique and S. Africa Customs Union by the reporting countries. This explanation is substantiated in table 1 by the excess of the declared exports in 1965 of Zambia and Malawi to the 23 reporting countries over the reported corresponding imports. This explanation also implies that in 1965 an amount of merchandise in this trade valued at \$24 million was of Southern Rhodesian origin. If this reasoning is accepted, it would mean that, during 1970-1974, exporters in S. Africa Customs Union and Mozambique were handling merchandise of Southern Rhodesia of the following values: 1970, \$317 million; 1971, \$243 million; 1972, \$298 million; 1973, \$398 million; 1974, \$333 million.

c/ Market economy countries in western Europe and Canada, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. The United States has not been included in this investigation because its statistical treatment of some strategic commodities, such as uranium ore, differs from that of South Africa,

Table 1

Export trade of Southern Rhodesia's neighbouring countries with 23 countries
(in millions of US dollars)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
<u>S. Africa Customs Union</u>										
South African exports	1 008	1 127	1 310	1 458	1 446	1 422	1 414	1 811	2 482	3 472
23 reporting countries' imports a/	1 060	1 210	1 401	1 589	1 668	1 674	1 640	2 128	2 965	3 630
Excess of imports over exports	52	83	91	131	222	252	226	317	483	158
<u>Mozambique</u>										
Mozambique's exports	60	62	69	83	84	90	92	175	140	176
23 reporting countries' imports a/	81	81	120	137	124	150	141	200	240	364
Excess of imports over exports	21	19	51	54	40	60	49	25	100	188
<u>Zambia</u>										
Zambian exports	457	622	544	694	939	872	549	620	968	1 031
23 reporting countries' imports a/	410	518	510	618	866	879	520	570	785	1 020
Excess of imports over exports	-47	-104	-34	-76	-73	7	-29	-50	-183	-11

Table 1 (continued)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
<u>Malawi</u>										
Malawian exports	26	33	40	27	28	37	46	44	62	63
23 reporting countries' imports a/	24	32	34	40	34	35	43	50	60	61
Excess of imports over exports	-2	-1	-6	13	6	-2	-3	6	-2	-2
<u>Total</u>										
Exporting countries' figures	1 551	1 844	1 963	2 262	2 497	2 421	2 101	2 650	3 652	4 742
23 reporting countries' imports a/	1 575	1 841	2 065	2 384	2 692	2 738	2 344	2 948	4 050	5 075
Excess of imports over exports	24	-3	102	122	195	317	243	298	398	333

a/ Reduced by 10 per cent to cover freight etc.

4. On statistical evidence, it is possible to analyse Southern Rhodesian exports in 1965-1974 as follows:

Table 2

Southern Rhodesian exports: 1965-1974

(in millions of US dollars)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Domestic exports (excluding gold) <u>a/</u>	399	238	238	234	297	346	379	474	625	600
To reporting countries <u>b/</u>	343	181	96	68	48	50	48	72	68	60
To S. Africa Customs Union <u>c/</u>	41	60	80	80	85	95	105	130	200	250
To non-reporting countries	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
To world markets via indirect trade	-	-3	62	86	164	201	226	272	357	290
Re-exports <u>a/</u>	43	24	17	12	10	8	9	9	12	12

a/ Southern Rhodesian figures except for 1973 and 1974, which are estimates.

b/ 1966-1974: import data, mostly c.i.f., less 10 per cent allowance for freight etc.

c/ 1966-1973: estimates derived from published data for imports of S. Africa Customs Union from "Africa" less exports to S. Africa Customs Union reported by African countries. However there are no published data for 1974 imports of S. Africa Customs Union.

5. In comparing Southern Rhodesian exports to world markets via indirect trade, shown in table 2, with the figures shown in table 1 as "Excess of imports over exports", the amount of re-exports should be added to the former because the importing countries identify the sources of supply without any distinction between national exports and re-exports. The comparison is shown below:

Table 3

Indirect exports of Southern Rhodesia

(in millions of US dollars)

	Excess of reported imports of 23 countries over exports of four neighbours of Southern Rhodesia	Indirect exports of Southern Rhodesia, including re-exports	Difference (A) - (B)
	<u>(A)</u>	<u>(B)</u>	
1965	24	43	-19
1966	-3	21	-24
1967	102	79	23
1968	122	98	24
1969	195	174	21
1970	317	209	108
1971	243	235	8
1972	298	293	5
1973	398	374	24
1974	333	314	19

The substantial agreement shown above for all years except 1970 indicates implicitly that since the imposition of United Nations sanctions, Southern Rhodesia has been able to send its exports to world markets indirectly via S. Africa Customs Union and Mozambique. The sizable discrepancy for the year 1970 does not detract from the contention taken above as the figure in column A is bigger than that in column B.

Southern Rhodesian imports

6. Southern Rhodesia's imports in 1974 were estimated to be \$515 million (compared with \$480 million in 1973). The 70 odd countries whose export statistics are set out in appendix II show that imports from them by Southern Rhodesia were distributed as follows: Malawi \$8 million, Switzerland \$5 million, Federal Republic of Germany \$3 million, United Kingdom \$2 million, United States \$1 million, other countries (also in appendix II) \$1 million, making a total of about \$20 million (compared with \$18 million in 1973). In addition to this recorded trade, it has been estimated that S. Africa Customs Union sent to Southern Rhodesia \$230 million worth of goods. It would appear, therefore, that some \$265 million of Southern Rhodesian imports have not been reflected in the corresponding 1974 export figures of world trade. The over-all situation of Southern Rhodesian imports for 1965-1974 is as follows:

Table 4

Southern Rhodesian imports: 1965-1974

(in millions of US dollars)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Imports <u>a/</u>	334	236	262	290	278	329	395	404	480	515
From reporting countries <u>b/</u>	253	79	63	44	15	16	18	18	18	20
From S. Africa Customs Union <u>c/</u>	78	110	135	150	155	180	215	182	220	230
Unspecified origin	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unaccounted for	-	47	64	96	108	133	162	204	242	265

a/ Southern Rhodesian figures except for 1973 and 1974, which are estimates.

b/ 1966-1974: exports to Southern Rhodesia reported by reporting countries.

c/ 1966-1973: estimates derived from published data for S. Africa Customs Union exports to "Africa" less imports from S. Africa Customs Union reported by African countries. In 1974 there are no published data for exports from S. Africa Customs Union.

7. It is not possible, at the present time, to investigate the true situation concerning the unaccounted portion of Southern Rhodesian imports for the years following the imposition of sanctions. However, in view of the fact that there has been considerable expansion of the import trade of S. Africa Customs Union, Mozambique and Angola (see table 5 below), it requires to be determined whether part of this expansion has been in the form of goods that ultimately reached Southern Rhodesia.

Table 5

Imports of selected neighbours of Southern Rhodesia
(in millions of US dollars)

	<u>S. Africa Customs Union</u>	<u>Mozambique</u>	<u>Angola</u>
1965	2,461	173	195
1966	2,307	207	208
1967	2,690	199	275
1968	2,638	234	308
1969	2,983	260	323
1970	3,565	326	368
1971	4,039	335	422
1972	3,657	327	392
1973	4,990	464	542
1974	7,226	462	606 <u>a/</u>

a/ Estimated.

Exports of specific commodities

Tobacco

8. The most important Southern Rhodesian export commodity was and probably still is tobacco, exports of which amounted to \$132 million in 1965. Normally, Southern Rhodesian exports of tobacco accounted for approximately 13 per cent of all world exports of unmanufactured tobacco and for over 25 per cent of flue-cured tobacco. In 1974, Switzerland, which took \$1.5 million worth of tobacco (1,000 metric tons), appeared to be the only reporting country of significance.

9. Increases in tobacco imports of the reporting countries from the neighbouring countries of Southern Rhodesia during recent years over the level of the earlier periods are of magnitudes calling for investigation. For this reason, an analysis was made, in terms of quantities, of the imports of the reporting countries from the neighbours of Southern Rhodesia, namely, Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia, Angola and S. Africa Customs Union, compared with corresponding exports of these neighbouring countries by direction. The result of this analysis is shown in table 6 below:

Table 6

Trade in tobacco of neighbouring countries of Southern Rhodesia with reporting countries which took more than 90 per cent of the tobacco exports of Southern Rhodesia in 1965

(in thousand metric tons)

<u>Imports from</u>	<u>S. Africa Customs Union^{a/}</u>	<u>Mozambique^{a/}</u>	<u>Malawi and Zambia</u>	<u>Angola^{a/}</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965	8.4	1.6	18.8 ^{b/}	2.0	30.9 ^{b/}
1966	7.4	2.1	16.1	2.1	27.8
1967	11.5	5.8	15.8	2.7	35.7
1968	13.5	7.0	17.1	3.4	41.0
1969	21.8	7.9	17.9	2.8	50.4
1970	24.2	10.8	14.6	2.7	52.3
1971	18.9	14.6	16.3	3.7	53.5
1972	19.0	19.3	17.5	4.1	59.9
1973	21.8	23.8	25.8	5.3	76.7
1974	16.7	23.8	25.5	7.0	73.0

<u>Exports of</u>	<u>S. Africa Customs Union^{a/}</u>	<u>Mozambique^{a/}</u>	<u>Malawi and Zambia</u>	<u>Angola^{a/}</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965	7.6	0.8	12.7	2.3	23.4
1966	7.5	0.7	16.6	2.9	27.7
1967	9.0	1.1	12.8	2.6	25.6
1968	10.0	1.3	13.4	3.2	27.9
1969	12.8	1.1	13.1	1.6	28.6
1970	11.1	0.9	16.0	1.6	29.6
1971	9.1	1.3	20.0	1.8	32.2
1972	10.3	2.4	23.7	1.8	38.2
1973	10.0 ^{c/}	1.8	32.5	6.8	51.1
1974	10.8 ^{c/}	1.5	45.7	6.1	64.0

^{a/} Data on analysis by country for the years 1965, 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974 are given in appendix III.

^{b/} Zambia exported in 1965 to Southern Rhodesia 9,318 tons, the bulk of which was destined for countries overseas. This fact is substantiated by the evidence that the reporting countries declared 7,950 metric tons as imports from Zambia while Zambia did not record exports of tobacco to the reporting countries. Beginning 1966 Zambia has sent most of its tobacco to Malawi for export overseas.

^{c/} Estimated.

10. It will be noted from table 6 that the imports for 1966 agreed with the corresponding exports. For 1965, agreement was also good, when account is taken of the fact that the reporting countries received 8,000 tons of tobacco from Zambia which were not reflected in the export statistics of Zambia (see foot-note b/ to table 6). However, in 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974 the imports of the reporting countries from the neighbours of Southern Rhodesia exceeded the corresponding exports of these neighbours by 10.1, 13.1, 21.8, 22.7, 21.3, 21.7, 25.6 and 9.0 thousand tons, respectively. These amounts may represent Southern Rhodesian tobacco which was able to reach world markets through false declarations of origin.

11. By incorporating the information given above with other elements relating to Southern Rhodesian tobacco, the over-all situation may be summarized as below:

Table 7

Tobacco situation in Southern Rhodesia

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Imports of reporting countries										
(a) Directly from Southern Rhodesia	85.3	36.7	8.6	4.0	2.3	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
(b) Via neighbouring countries	-	-	10.1	13.1	21.8	22.7	21.3	21.7	25.6	9.0
Recorded imports of S. Africa Customs Union believed to be of Southern Rhodesian origin	1.7	11.3	9.1	3.9	3.7	8.9	6.0	10.3	12.9 ^{a/}	10.0
Total	87.0	48.0	27.8	21.0	27.8	32.8	28.3	33.0	39.5	20.0
Tobacco crop	111 ^{b/}	113	94	60	62	62	65	73	56	75
Southern Rhodesian Exports	120.7 ^{c/}	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Tobacco estimated held in stock from current year's production	-	65	66	39	34	29	37	40	16	55

a/ Estimated.

b/ 9,700 tons representing the shortfall of the 1965 tobacco crop in meeting current export requirements were probably made good by Zambian tobacco (see foot-note b/ to table 6).

c/ Excess of Southern Rhodesian official exports of 120,700 tons over the imports of 87,000 tons is explained by: 20,400 tons as stocks held in bond by importing countries and failures in recording as Southern Rhodesian tobacco on account of multilateral trade patterns; 8,000 tons of Zambian tobacco as part of Southern Rhodesian exports; 5,500 tons as exports of non-reporting countries.

12. In examining the data given in table 7, it becomes apparent that during the eight years following the initiation of sanctions, 1967-1974, over 41 per cent (230,000 tons) of Southern Rhodesian tobacco crops reached world markets. However, a substantial amount of tobacco could have reached world markets in various clandestine ways that cannot be detected statistically. This possibility is revealed by the United Kingdom estimate of 126,000 tons (or \$US 77 million) as being stock held by Southern Rhodesia at the end of 1968. According to the data set out in table 7, the corresponding stock figure should have been 163,000 tons, representing the tobacco accumulated during the period 1966-1968. If the United Kingdom estimate is correct, it would mean that an average of about 12,000 tons of tobacco was being shipped out annually from Southern Rhodesia in addition to those recorded and inferred in table 7. If, on the other hand, the tobacco stock in Southern Rhodesia at the end of 1970, 140,000 tons, as revealed by the press in South Africa is to be considered realistic, then an average of 17,000 tons of tobacco, instead of 12,000 was being shipped out annually in various clandestine ways that cannot be detected statistically. Furthermore, there has been an increasing number of reports d/ to the effect that Southern Rhodesia has been able, during the past few years, to dispose of its entire stockpile of old crops in the world market. If this is true, the clandestine trade in Rhodesian tobacco must have been extremely active. As inferred in table 7, since the United Nations sanctions, such trade could amount to 380,000 tons, which are not recorded in any importing country's trade returns.

Asbestos

13. Another important commodity is asbestos, Southern Rhodesian exports of which amounted to \$30 million in 1965. There were almost no imports from Southern Rhodesia by the reporting countries in the period 1969-1974. In 1968, the recorded imports of the reporting countries amounted to \$1.7 million (compared with \$24 million in the year 1965 and \$3.4 million in 1967). This amount was accounted for by the Federal Republic of Germany (\$1.2 million) and the United States (\$0.5 million). The United States explained its imports as shipments before 16 December 1966, the effective date of resolution 232 (1966). Similar to the case for Southern Rhodesian tobacco, there appear to be strong possibilities that Southern Rhodesia is sending asbestos to world markets via its neighbouring countries, chiefly South Africa. In these circumstances, an analysis was made (in terms of quantities) of the imports of the reporting countries from S. Africa Customs Union, together with the corresponding exports of S. Africa Customs Union for the period 1965-1974. The results of the analysis are shown in table 8.

d/ For instance, on p. 32 of the September 1975 issue of "Tobacco Situation" published by the Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, the following findings are recorded:

"The 1975 Rhodesian crop suffered from rains but is estimated below last season's 165 million pound outturn. With the large stock pile from earlier years virtually gone, no quota applies for 1975."

It should be noted that 165 million pounds mentioned above is the equivalent to approximately 75,000 tons. "Quota" means acreage allowed to produce tobacco. The last sentence means that no Government restriction on the production of tobacco is to be applied to the size of the 1975 crop.

Table 8

Trade in asbestos of S. Africa Customs Union with reporting
countries which took about 80 per cent of the asbestos
exports of Southern Rhodesia in 1965

(in thousand metric tons)

	Imports from S. Africa Customs Union of:			Exports of S. Africa Customs Union to:		
	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Spain</u>	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Spain</u>
55 ^{a/}	201	26.3	16.6	207	27.1	10.9
56	234	35.0 ^{b/}	20.2	214	27.4	13.2
67	300	67.9	25.3	215	29.4	8.0
68	317	65.2	30.5	233	33.4	10.0
69	355	79.8	39.4	252	43.5	11.0
70	356	94.0	43.7	258	63.5	11.6
71 ^{a/}	351	99.5	32.1	254	65.3	8.8
72 ^{a/}	354	100.2	34.4	274	63.2	10.7
73	467 ^{a/}	112.2	50.9	350 ^{c/}	N.A.	N.A.
74	446 ^{a/}	124.1	50.4	250 ^{c/}	N.A.	N.A.

^{a/} For a more detailed analysis by country see appendix IV.

^{b/} Estimated on the basis of value data; the official quantity figure of 28.8 thousand metric tons given by Japan appears to be a printing error.

^{c/} Estimated.

14. It will be noted from table 8 above that, while the imports for 1965 agreed, by and large, with the corresponding exports, those for 1966 and 1967 exceeded the corresponding exports by 20,000 and 85,000 tons, respectively. For 1968, imports of the reporting countries exceeded South African exports by 84,000 tons; for 1969, by 103,000 tons; for 1970, by 98,000 tons; for 1971, by 97,000 tons; for 1972, by 80,000 tons; for 1973, by 105,000 tons; and for 1974, by 162,000 tons. As the exports of S. Africa Customs Union appear consistent with the amount of asbestos produced within the Union, these excesses of imports may possibly be exports of Southern Rhodesian asbestos via the Union. By incorporating this information with other elements relating to Southern Rhodesian exports, the over-all situation may be summarized as in table 9 which follows:

Table 9

Asbestos situation in Southern Rhodesia

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Imports of reporting countries: <u>a/</u>										
(a) Directly from Southern Rhodesia	114.6	53.7	14.8	6.7	-	0.2	-	0.2	0.8	1.7
(b) Via S. Africa Customs Union	-	20.0	85.0	84.0	103.0	98.0	97.0	80.0	117.0	196.0
Recorded imports of S. Africa Customs Union believed to be of Southern Rhodesian origin	8.6	11.2	14.0	13.1	15.4	17.2	11.8	16.0	18.4	30.0
Imports of reporting countries from Mozambique <u>b/</u>	3.5	3.7	2.7	3.9	5.1	5.5	6.1	8.0	14.0	18.9
Total exports sent to reporting countries	126.7 ^{c/}	88.6	116.5	107.7	123.5	120.9	114.9	104.2	150.2	246.6

a/ Estimated.

b/ For country analysis for the years 1965, 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974 see appendix V.

c/ Corresponding exports reported by Southern Rhodesia as 131,200 tons.

15. It should be pointed out that Southern Rhodesia produced 160,000 tons of asbestos in 1965 of which 131,000 tons were exported. Disregarding the possible available stock accumulated prior to 1974, the estimated Southern Rhodesia 1974 exports of 247,000 tons would imply that the production of asbestos in 1974 could have reached 270,000 tons. While this figure appears to be high, it may not be completely unreasonable in light of the fact that the volume expansion of over-all mining production in 1974 over 1965 was reported as 66 per cent by Southern Rhodesia. e/ Needless to say, if a part of the heavy exports in 1974 represents some of the stock accumulated over the earlier years, the implicit production level would be lower.

e/ Source: Monthly Digest of Statistics, Central Statistical Office, Salisbury, Rhodesia.

Chrome ore

16. The chief importer of Southern Rhodesia's chrome ore has been, traditionally, the United States, to which Southern Rhodesia sent \$5 million worth of chrome ore out of total exports of \$10.7 million in 1965. In 1967, the United States imported \$3.4 million worth of chrome ore, which was explained by the authorities as goods shipped from Southern Rhodesia before 16 December 1966, and by 1968, imports of Southern Rhodesian chrome ore appear to have virtually ceased until 1971, when \$0.8 million were imported. In 1972, such imports reached \$2.8 million while in 1973 they dropped to \$1.5 million. In 1974 the United States imported \$2.5 million from Southern Rhodesia. The possibility of Southern Rhodesian chrome ore being exported to the neighbouring countries was investigated. For this purpose an analysis was made (in terms of gross quantities) of the imports of the reporting countries from S. Africa Customs Union, together with the corresponding exports of S. Africa Customs Union for the period 1964-1974. The results of the analysis are shown in table 10 below:

Table 10

Trade in chrome ore of S. Africa Customs Union with reporting countries which took about 85 per cent of the chrome ore exports of Southern Rhodesia in 1964

(in thousand metric tons gross)

	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>United States</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Western Europe</u>
<u>Imports from S. Africa Customs Union</u>				
1964	671	432	40	199
1965 ^{a/}	715	437	52	222
1966	1,037	723	67	245
1967	822	433	183	206
1968	863	385	179	295
1969	1,082	363	246	466
1970	1,607	376	710	520
1971 ^{a/}	1,618	383	720	508
1972 ^{a/}	1,010	238	445	338
1973 ^{a/}	1,291	244	619	420
1974	1,079	258	424	395
<u>Exports of S. Africa Customs Union</u>				
1964	637	386	33	216
1965 ^{a/}	776	396	109	264
1966	856	580	32	240

Table 10 (continued)

	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>United States</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Western Europe</u>
<u>Exports of S. Africa</u>				
<u>Customs Union (continued)</u>				
1967	656	292	111	246
1968	817	358	135	318
1969	908	369	154	379
1970	1,033	361	274	392
1971 ^{a/}	1,210	377	355	473
1972 ^{a/}	871	284	253	317
1973	1,145 ^{b/}	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
1974	760 ^{b/}	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

a/ For complete country analysis see appendix VI.

b/ Estimated.

17. It will be noted that, for 1964 and 1965, the sum of the total imports and exports for the two years agree well, but there were significant excesses of the total imports over the total exports for most of the following years. These excesses could quite possibly represent chrome ore of Southern Rhodesian origin. By incorporating these excess tonnages with other elements relating to Southern Rhodesian exports, the over-all situation may be summarized as below:

Table 11

Chrome ore situation in Southern Rhodesia

(in thousand metric tons gross)

	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Imports of reporting countries:											
(a) Directly from Southern Rhodesia	406	397	179	136	-	-	-	22	68	35	57
(b) Via S. Africa Customs Union	-	-	181	166	46	174	574	408	139	146	319
Recorded imports of S. Africa Customs Union believed to be of Southern Rhodesian origin	49	84	98	75	23	32	22	21	124	123	76
Imports of reporting countries from Mozambique ^{a/}	16	20	52	30	41	21	13	20	18	82	52
Total exports of Southern Rhodesia	471	501	510	407	110 ^{b/}	227 ^{b/}	609	471	349	386	504

^{a/} For complete country analysis see appendix V (b).

^{b/} Data on production, imports and exports of chrome ore of South Africa suggest that, during 1968 and 1969, a substantial amount of Southern Rhodesian ore (probably 200,000-300,000 tons per year) could have entered South Africa without being recorded in the regular trade returns. If such unrecorded imports were included, the figures would probably be in the 400,000-ton range.

Copper

18. Southern Rhodesia's copper exports in 1965 amounted to \$18.3 million. Of this amount, \$10.6 million were exports to the Federal Republic of Germany, \$1.8 million to Poland, \$1.5 million to the United Kingdom, \$1.4 million to Italy, \$1 million to West Malaysia and \$2 million were distributed among other countries. The recorded imports of the reporting countries amounted to \$19 million in 1966, \$11 million in 1967 and \$10 million in 1968. The reporting countries show only \$4,000 worth of copper imports from Southern Rhodesia in 1969 and almost nothing in 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974. Since the adoption of resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966, the Federal Republic of Germany appears to have been the sole importer of Southern Rhodesian copper in 1967 and 1968.

19. In terms of quantities, the annual curtailment of Southern Rhodesian copper exports for the period 1966-1968 was gradual, namely, from a level in 1965 of 18,400 metric tons to 13,300 in 1966, 10,000 in 1967, 7,800 in 1968 and almost nil during the period 1969-1974. In view of the fact that both S. Africa Customs Union and Zambia are heavy exporters of copper and that both, in varying degrees, together with Southern Rhodesia, use the transport facilities in Mozambique, it is very difficult to determine the true situation.

Pig iron and ferroalloys

20. Southern Rhodesia's exports of these commodities in 1965 amounted to \$11.7 million of which \$4.7 million were ferrochrome. In that year, the important receivers of such exports were Japan (208,000 metric tons of pig iron (\$6.7 million)) and the United Kingdom (7,700 tons of ferrochrome (\$2.1 million)). Imports of these commodities from Southern Rhodesia in 1966, as reported by the reporting countries, amounted to \$9.6 million, of which the United States share was \$3.6 million (\$2.3 million of pig iron and \$1.3 million of ferroalloys). By 1969, imports of these commodities by reporting countries had almost ceased, although there were small amounts of imports in 1969 (\$0.9 million) and in 1968 (\$0.2 million), which were explained by importers as shipments before December 1966. However, it should be noted that in 1972 the United States imported from Southern Rhodesia \$4.9 million of ferroalloys (21,700 metric tons), \$12.7 million in 1973 and \$9.8 million in 1974.

Other commodities

21. Other commodities exported by Southern Rhodesia are meat and meat products, sugar, hides and skins, leather and iron ore. Imports of these commodities into the reporting countries from Southern Rhodesia in 1974 amounted to \$5.3 million (compared with \$34 million in the year 1965, \$3 million in the year 1970, \$3.1 million in the year 1971, \$3.5 million in the year 1972 and \$7.2 million in the year 1973). Because of the small magnitude of the trade involved in each commodity it is not possible to make a comprehensive analysis for each commodity. The difficulty lies in the fact that S. Africa Customs Union and some of the other neighbours are much more important exporters of the same commodities. As in the case of copper, it is possible for Southern Rhodesia to export at least some part of these commodities under false declarations, using its neighbours as the origin of these goods. In these circumstances, the inflation of the imports recorded by importing countries in comparison with the corresponding

exports of Southern Rhodesia's neighbours would probably not be marked enough to allow any meaningful conclusion to be drawn. In addition to the possibility described above, S. Africa Customs Union is understood, based on the statistical information relating to its over-all "imports from Africa", to be taking significant amounts of these commodities as imports. These imports are estimated to be at the level of \$2 million worth of meat products annually for the period 1967-1969 and \$1 million of sugar. Furthermore, it is conceivable that, because of the heavy traffic of ocean transport via Mozambique and South Africa during the closure of the Suez Canal, the demand for meats and other provisions in the form of ships' stores could have provided an important outlet for the produce of Southern Rhodesia. Indeed, available statistics regarding South African meat in the form of ships' stores registered important increases in recent periods. It is possible that Southern Rhodesia, whose produce is more competitive, may very well have benefited from the expansion of this market.

Maize

22. Southern Rhodesia normally produced a little over 800,000 metric tons of maize, mainly for domestic consumption. Its exports of this commodity were insignificant. In fact, it was necessary to import a small amount (23,000 tons in 1965) to supplement the locally produced maize for domestic consumption. However, as a result of the régime's attempt to encourage agricultural diversification to compensate for the reduction in tobacco exports owing to sanctions, there has been a substantial increase in the acreage under maize. According to the most recent information, Southern Rhodesia produced the following quantities of maize during the period 1965-1974.

Table 12
Production of maize in Southern Rhodesia
(in thousand metric tons)

<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
822	952	1,000	950	1,020	700	1,179	1,542	617	1,700

23. If the annual domestic requirement was of a magnitude of 800-850,000 tons, the production data shown above would imply that there should have been about 2.3 million tons available for export during the years 1967-1974. This amount may indeed have reached world markets via Mozambique, as explained in the following paragraphs.

24. Mozambique normally produced about 400,000 tons of maize, also mainly for domestic consumption. It also imported a small amount to supplement its locally produced maize. Table 13 describes the situation of maize in Mozambique for the period 1965-1974.

Table 13

Production, trade and apparent consumption
of maize in Mozambique

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Production	390	440	500	430	410	310	310	430	565	550
Imports	43	7	-	-	-	35	24	3	1	1
Exports	-	-	25	122	25	12	-	92	19	-
Apparent consumption	433	447	475	308	385	333	334	341	547	551

25. In spite of the fact that, during the period covered in table 13, production of maize in Mozambique did not increase in any significant degree, some countries began importing from Mozambique in the year 1967. Mozambique's declared exports are shown in table 13. Declared imports of the maize-importing countries from Mozambique are considerably higher. Details of these imports are given in table 14 below.

Table 14

Imports of maize from Mozambique

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Reporting countries										
Belgium-Luxembourg	Nil	Nil	42	32	-	-	40	59	-	-
Egypt	Nil	Nil	105	93	14	-	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	-
France	Nil	Nil	20	11	-	-	-	-	-	-
Germany, Federal Republic of	Nil	Nil	99	59	-	-	15	24	-	4
Italy	Nil	Nil	26	40	-	-	-	12	-	-
Japan	Nil	30	145	184	149	21	10	261	79	355
Netherlands	Nil	Nil	6	12	-	-	-	1	-	-
Portugal	Nil	Nil	15	78	25	16	0	58	46	-
Switzerland	Nil	Nil	-	-	-	-	2	5	-	0
Total	Nil	30	458	509	188	37	67	420	125	359

26. As may be seen from the data shown above, maize-importing countries received 2,163,000 tons of maize from Mozambique during the period 1967-1974. Bearing in mind the modest amount of Mozambique's own declared exports, this figure accommodates the possibility that the bulk of the amount of Southern Rhodesia's exportable maize for the same period, namely 2.3 million tons (see para. 23 above), could have been channelled to importing countries via Mozambique.

Table 15

Production and trade in maize of S. Africa Customs Union
(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Production <u>a/</u>	4,490	5,056	9,762	5,316	4,953	6,423	8,600	9,630	4,160	11,035
Exports:										
calendar year										
12 months	326	46	2,001	2,949	760	1,201	1,466	3,155	1,317	N.A.
December-November <u>b/</u>	345	59	1,667	3,078	911	1,207	1,252	3,104	1,600	N.A.
Derived exports <u>c/</u>	325	58	1,477	3,023	1,031	1,371	1,363	3,270	1,487	11,175

a/ Excluding non-commercial production in villages.

b/ Twelve months ending November of year stated. Allowance of one month for ocean transport is made in order to make export figures more comparable to the reported import figures.

c/ Imports from S. Africa Customs Union by reporting countries.

27. A study of production and trade in maize of the S. Africa Customs Union, the results of which are given in table 15 above, also shows increased trade activity beginning in 1967. A comparison of reported exports with derived exports, however, shows substantial agreement. A similar pattern is observed in a study of the trade in maize of Angola and Malawi.

Nickel and nickel alloys, unwrought

28. Southern Rhodesia mined small amounts of nickel ore prior to 1969 but has greatly increased its production since 1969 as shown in table 16, together with similar data for South Africa for comparison.

Table 16

Production of nickel ore (metal content)
and unwrought nickel and nickel alloys

(in metric tons)

	<u>Southern Rhodesia</u>		<u>South Africa</u>	
	<u>Ore</u>	<u>Metal, unwrought</u>	<u>Ore</u>	<u>Metal, unwrought</u>
1965	754	-	3,000	2,500
1966	700	-	5,400	2,500
1967	700	-	5,400	3,000
1968	1,000	-	5,500	8,000
1969	4,000	2,500	11,000	8,500
1970	11,000	5,000	11,557	9,000
1971	11,600	10,000	12,761	10,000
1972	12,000	10,000	11,656	10,000
1973	11,800	10,000	19,426	15,000
1974	12,000	10,000	22,100	16,000

29. Japan reports that it imported 3,982 tons (gross) f/ of nickel ore (\$674,000) from Southern Rhodesia in 1965, 3,888 tons in 1966 and 1,812 tons in 1967. In its published trade data for 1965, Southern Rhodesia did not report exports of nickel ore separately because of their relative insignificance but included them in the item "metallic ores, concentrates etc. n.e.s.". Under this heading, it sent \$833,000 to Japan, with no quantity information. Those shipments to Japan accounted for 92 per cent of the 1965 exports under this heading. It is likely therefore that during the period 1965-1968 all the nickel ore mined was exported. Beginning with 1969, however, Southern Rhodesia apparently exported almost its entire production of nickel mainly in the form of unwrought metal via South Africa until 1972, during which period the United States imported directly from Southern Rhodesia \$4.5 million worth of metal (1,634 tons). In 1973 the United States imported \$11 million worth of metal (3,577 tons), and in 1974 \$5.6 million worth of metal (1,726 tons).

f/ Nickel ores of 1.5 per cent metal content and above are considered rich and those below 1 per cent are considered as low grade.

Table 17

S. Africa Customs Union exports of unwrought nickel and nickel alloys and corresponding imports as reported by reporting countries

(in metric tons)

	14 important reporting countries	UK	USA	Italy	Germany (Fed. Rep.)	Japan	Belg.- Lux.	Sweden	Spain
Imports from S. Africa Customs Union									
1965	1 139	1 139	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1966	1 408	1 294	33	81	-	-	-	-	-
1967	6 033	205	247	551	5 010	-	-	-	-
1968	5 699	203	217	553	4 686	25	-	-	-
1969	4 856	455	263	644	2 582	308	92	346	55
1970	11 018	745	89	926	5 329	2 346	265	717	266
1971	11 063	1 778	843	875	4 160	1 245	170	1 264	260
1972	11 622	375	2 532	1 128	3 945	588	284	1 420	768
1973	12 237	161	2 755	1 727	3 647	1 470	362	861	410
1974	16 891	187	3 624	1 762	5 461	3 380	430	872	350
Exports of S. Africa Customs Union									
1965	1 094	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
1966	1 286	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
1967	4 003	171	197	559	3 034	-	-	-	-
1968	9 779	309	780	560	7 372	-	-	563	-
1969	5 167	608	1 387	737	1 593	-	107	-	97
1970	3 454	766	125	981	23	371	988	56	54
1971	4 800	1 645	402	853	86	48	53	91	198
1972	10 193	582	2 716	928	70	568	109	-	374
1973	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
1974	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

30. Since South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are the only two countries in Africa that produce nickel in significant amounts and since their close co-operation in political and economic matters has been evident especially since the application of the United Nations sanctions, it is appropriate to study the production and trade of nickel of these two countries jointly. As may be seen from table 16 above, Southern Rhodesia did not produce any metal prior to 1969. Most of the small amounts of ore produced were probably sent to South Africa for smelting. During the period 1965-1968, the production of ore in the two countries amounted to 22,500 tons and 16,000 tons of metal were produced in South Africa. During the period 1969-1974, the corresponding figures for ore and metal are 151,000 and 114,000 tons respectively.

31. Turning to the problem of disposal of the metal produced, the juxtaposition of the export figures of South Africa and the corresponding import figures as reported by 14 important reporting countries in table 17 confirms the earlier statement in paragraph 28 above that Southern Rhodesia apparently exported almost its entire production of nickel via South Africa. For the period 1965-1968, South Africa reported to have exported 16,162 tons of metal while the 14 reporting countries claimed to have received 14,279 tons. The discrepancy of 1,883 tons probably is mainly due to the fact that part of the extraordinarily large volume of 1968 exports (9,779 tons) reached the importing countries or cleared through the customs of importing countries only in the early part of 1969. Small amounts exported to countries other than the 14 reporting countries could be another reason, although minor, for the discrepancy.

32. During the period 1969-1974, table 17 reveals massive discrepancies in 1970 and 1971 between South Africa's declared exports and the 14 reporting countries' corresponding imports (8,254 tons of exports against 22,081 tons of imports). It becomes therefore quite clear that, of the 22,000 tons of metal imported from South Africa, a major portion must be of Southern Rhodesian origin. Table 18 represents a statistical analysis of the nickel situation in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia during the period 1969-1974 in which an approximate agreement is discernible between the amount of metal available for exports and the actual imports received by reporting countries.

Table 18

Production and trade of unwrought nickel and nickel alloys
in S. Africa Customs Union and Southern Rhodesia

(in metric tons)

	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>Total 6 years</u>
Production	11,000	14,000	20,000	20,000	25,000	24,000	114,000
Consumption	5,000	5,500	4,000	4,000	5,000	5,000	28,500
Metal available for export	6,000	8,500	16,000	16,000	20,000	19,000	85,500
Reported imports	4,875	11,351	12,740	14,732	17,059	19,423	80,180
14 countries from S. Africa	4,856	11,018	11,063	11,622	12,237	16,891	67,687
Netherlands' imports from Mozambique	19	333	1,677	1,476	1,245	806	5,556
US imports from S. Rhodesia	-	-	-	1,634	3,577	1,726	6,937

Imports of specific commodities

33. Exports of the reporting countries to Southern Rhodesia of the four commodity groups specified in resolution 232 (1966), paragraph 2 (d)-(f), namely, motor vehicles and their parts, petroleum products, crude petroleum, and aircraft and their parts, are estimated to have amounted to approximately \$0.13 million in 1974 (compared with \$36 million in the year 1965, \$1.2 million in the year 1967, \$0.5 million in the year 1971, \$0.5 million in the year 1972 and \$0.11 million in the year 1973).

Motor vehicles and their parts

34. Among the four commodity groups, motor vehicles and their parts is the most important. In 1974, the reporting countries' exports of these commodities to Southern Rhodesia was \$0.05 million (compared with \$34 million in the year 1965, \$6.1 million in the year 1966, \$1.0 million in the year 1967, \$0.3 million in the year 1972 and \$0.08 million in the year 1973).

Table 19

Trade of S. Africa Customs Union in motor vehicles and their parts with reporting countries which provided about 93 per cent of imports of motor vehicles and their parts by Southern Rhodesia in 1965

(in millions of US dollars)

	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>UK</u>	<u>Germany (Fed. Rep.)</u>	<u>USA</u>	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>France</u>	<u>Italy</u>	<u>Australia</u>
Exports to S. Africa Customs Union									
1965	289	128	56	38	25	16	9	8	5
1966	288	120	60	43	23	16	10	8	6
1967	310	112	67	54	17	27	12	11	7
1968	331	96	84	50	20	30	17	11	13
1969	444	121	106	67	16	63	19	16	28
1970	537	145	136	55	20	73	33	23	41
1971	614	176	133	51	13	124	37	23	46
1972	519	112	140	38	10	103	39	13	50
1973	741	148	249	49	11	132	50	-	64
1974	983	176	323	69	23	220	65	36	45
Imports of S. Africa Customs Union									
1965	289	130	55	38	21	18	9	9	5
1966	273	111	56	44	21	15	10	8	5
1967	305	104	64	55	20	27	11	11	7
1968	318	93	79	51	18	29	13	12	14
1969	411	106	96	71	13	60	15	17	26
1970	496	127	122	65	18	70	20	20	43
1971	575	157	127	61	15	117	24	22	42
1972	491	108	134	39	12	103	21	13	50
1973	693	133	235	60	12	121	33	20	66
1974	904	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

35. There appears to be a strong possibility that Southern Rhodesia may be receiving motor vehicles and their parts through neighbouring countries. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that Southern Rhodesia is maintaining its exporting pattern of this commodity group to its neighbouring countries. Malawi, for instance, reported annual imports of \$0.4 million from Southern Rhodesia of motor vehicles and their parts during the period 1967-1969 (compared with \$1.3 million in 1965). For that reason, an analysis was made (in terms of value) ^{g/} of the exports of the reporting countries to S. Africa Customs Union and also to Mozambique, Angola, Malawi and Zambia, together with the corresponding imports by the above-mentioned countries from the reporting countries. The results of the analysis are shown in tables 19 and 20.

Table 20

Trade of Mozambique, Angola, Malawi and Zambia in motor vehicles and their parts with the reporting countries

(in millions of US dollars)

	<u>Exports of reporting countries to Mozambique, Angola, Malawi and Zambia</u>	<u>Imports of Mozambique, Angola, Malawi and Zambia from reporting countries</u>
1965	48	49
1966	73	62
1967	90	84
1968	104	94
1969	95	86
1970	121	95
1971	142	113
1972	128	122
1973	157	139
1974	195	180 ^{a/}

^{a/} Estimated.

36. It may be noted from tables 19 and 20 that in the year 1965 exports agree well with the corresponding imports. However, since 1965 exports by the reporting countries to South Africa and to the four countries of Angola, Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia exceeded the corresponding imports reported by these five countries by a larger discrepancy.

^{g/} It is not possible to make a comprehensive study in terms of quantities because of the heterogeneous nature of this group of commodities. Countries use different units of quantity to express the physical volume of imports and exports.

Following are the actual discrepancies in \$US million:

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
S. Africa Customs Union	15	5	13	33	41	39	28	48	79
The four countries	11	6	10	9	26	29	6	18	15
Total	26	11	23	42	67	68	34	66	94

37. S. Africa Customs Union (not a reporting country) traditionally exported a substantial amount of motor vehicles and their parts to Southern Rhodesia. The amount of \$2.2 million was reported by Southern Rhodesia for 1965. Although S. Africa Customs Union has not released a meaningful analysis by country of destination for this commodity group since 1964, a study of its partner countries' data makes it possible to estimate the approximate amount that Southern Rhodesia has received from S. Africa Customs Union.

Table 21

Exports of motor vehicles and their parts of S. Africa Customs Union

(in millions of US dollars)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Total exports ^{a/}	12.2	17.3	22.0	24.4	20.0	20.4	24.0	24.9	28.2	30.3
(of which re-exports) ^{a/}	(4.7)	(7.3)	(10.5)	(16.1)	(13.4)	(13.5)	(16.3)	(16.5)	(16.6) ^{b/}	(17.0) ^{b/}
To reporting countries ^{a/}	1.8	2.1	3.3	3.4	4.2	1.6	2.9	3.0 ^{b/}	3.2 ^{b/}	3.5 ^{b/}
To neighbouring countries other than Southern Rhodesia ^{c/}	4.4	5.4	5.1	3.4	3.8	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.7	4.0 ^{b/}
To Southern Rhodesia ^{d/}	2.2 ^{d/}	6.0 ^{b/}	13.6	17.6	12.0	15.9	18.0	18.6	21.3	22.5
Unknown destination	3.8	3.8								

^{a/} Reported by S. Africa Customs Union.

^{b/} Estimated.

^{c/} Reported by partner countries.

^{d/} Reported by Southern Rhodesia.

Petroleum

38. There is little information regarding petroleum supplies to Southern Rhodesia. It is known that Southern Rhodesia's only oil refinery at Umtali was closed in January 1966 and that, therefore, no further imports of crude petroleum were required after that date. Prior to 1966 Iran, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia had been suppliers of petroleum products to Southern Rhodesia as they had been to its neighbouring countries as well. Since the introduction of the United Nations sanctions in 1966 no statistical evidence can be found that any country has been sending petroleum products of any meaningful magnitude to Southern Rhodesia. Yet there has not been any report that any significant petroleum shortage has existed in Southern Rhodesia during all these years of the United Nations sanctions. It is therefore reasonable to assume that a steady flow, in sufficient quantity, of petroleum products to Southern Rhodesia through her neighbours has been efficiently arranged. In order to study how an arrangement of this type has worked, it is necessary to examine the petroleum situation of Southern Rhodesia's neighbours.

39. Table 22 gives tonnage data in yearly averages for the periods 1962-1965 and 1966-1974 and annual figures for 1972, 1973 and 1974 on production, trade and apparent consumption of petroleum products for S. Africa Customs Union, Mozambique and Angola. It will be noted that production of petroleum products during the period 1966-1974 in these three neighbours of Southern Rhodesia was more than twice that of the earlier period of 1962-1965, thanks to the great expansion in refining capacity in South Africa. Thus the need for importing gasoline, for instance, was rather reduced in the latter period (410,000 tons per year in comparison with 970,000 tons per year in the earlier period). However, relatively heavy imports of fuel oil (1,730,000 tons per year) were still needed in order to satisfy the bunkering requirements of ships that had been diverted from the Suez Canal route since the closure of the Canal in June 1967.

40. There have been small amounts of petroleum products exported by Southern Rhodesia's neighbours but hardly anything significant went to Southern Rhodesia. According to the "Annual Statement of External Trade" for 1964 and 1965 published by Southern Rhodesia, most of the imports of gasoline, kerosene and fuel oils were imported from the Persian Gulf area and practically nothing was imported from its neighbours. The only significant amounts of petroleum products imported from South Africa were lubricating oils and greases. Exports of Mozambique which amounted to an annual average of about 300,000 tons since the early 1960s were mainly destined for S. Africa Customs Union with only marginal amounts sent to Southern Rhodesia, as indicated below: 2,542 tons of gasoline and 2,350 tons of distilled fuels in 1965; the corresponding amounts in 1966 (1967) are 7,007 (19,987) and 576 (13,303). Since 1967 no exports to Southern Rhodesia have been recorded.

Table 22

Production, trade and apparent consumption of petroleum products
for S. Africa Customs Union, Mozambique and Angola

(in thousand metric tons)

<u>Country, product and year</u>	<u>Production</u>	<u>Imports</u>	<u>Exports</u>	<u>Bunkers</u>	<u>Apparent consumption</u>
S. Africa Customs Union					
Gasoline					
1962-65, yearly average	985	937	3	6	1 913
1966-74, yearly average	2 394	366	44	7	2 709
1972	2 893	48E	43	31	2 867
1973	2 999	21E	60E	10E	2 950
1974	3 000E	20E	60E	10E	2 950
Kerosene and jet fuel					
1962-65, yearly average	206	410	9	18	588
1966-74, yearly average	417	353	18	51	701
1972	556	286E	5E	58	779
1973	652	167E	5E	50	764
1974	650E	160E	5E	50E	755
Fuel oils					
1962-65, yearly average	2 026	653	255	670	1 754
1966-74, yearly average	5 515	1 424	145	2 939	3 855
1972	7 265	1 766	42	3 352	5 637
1973	6 828	1 000E	45E	3 350E	4 433
1974	6 830	1 000E	45E	3 340E	4 435
Mozambique					
Gasoline					
1962-65, yearly average	100	20	82	-	38
1966-74, yearly average	124	23	68	-	79
1972	120	14	44	-	90
1973	120	15	37	-	98
1974	71	11E	18E	1E	63
Kerosene and jet fuel					
1962-65, yearly average	-	19	-	-	19
1966-74, yearly average	26	22	4	5	39
1972	32	28	-	8	52
1973	60	19	-	18	74
1974	25	9E	-	15E	19
Fuel oils					
1962-65, yearly average	369	36	182	119	104
1966-74, yearly average	505	112	200	173	244
1972	525	126	184	166	301
1973	504	136	119	178	343
1974	241	178E	1E	183E	235

E = Estimate.

Table 22 (continued)

<u>Country, product and year</u>	<u>Production</u>	<u>Imports</u>	<u>Exports</u>	<u>Bunkers</u>	<u>Apparent consumption</u>
Angola					
Gasoline					
1962-65, yearly average	56	10	12	-	54
1966-73, yearly average	59	25	-	-	84
1972	48	86	-	-	134
1973	64	52	-	-	116
1974	70E	30E	-	-	100
Kerosene and jet fuel					
1962-65, yearly average	24	7	-	13	18
1966-73, yearly average	73	9	-	53	29
1972	93	15	-	71	37
1973	91	8	-	65	34
1974	90E	4E	-	56E	30
Fuel oils					
1962-65, yearly average	365	23	55	114	219
1966-73, yearly average	499	191	93	193	404
1972	482	331	127	137	549
1973	539	273	96	199	517
1974	575E	275E	130E	220E	500

E = Estimate.

41. The annual gasoline consumption of Southern Rhodesia during 1962-1965 was reported as approximately 150,000 tons. Based on the available data on motor vehicles in use, which in general determines gasoline consumption, the annual requirement of this product during 1966-1974 could amount to about 180,000 tons. As may be seen from table 22 above, South Africa did not export any significant amount of gasoline during 1962-1965 but did export about 45,000 tons per year during 1966-1974. The bulk of this amount could have been sent to Southern Rhodesia. This amount together with the possible supply from Mozambique (see 1966-1967 recorded exports in para. 39 above) would probably meet one third of Southern Rhodesia's annual requirement of gasoline. The balance would have to come from South Africa's gasoline stock which was more than adequate to meet Southern Rhodesia's needs, as explained in the following paragraphs.

42. Gasoline is mostly consumed by road motor vehicles. According to a survey of fuel consumption in 1972 for European countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, made by the secretariat of OECD, more than 97 per cent of the total consumption of 83.7 million tons of gasoline was consumed by passenger road motor vehicles. Table 23 shows the consumption of gasoline in 1972 by passenger motor vehicles in selected countries. It shows a marked difference between the maximum amount of gasoline that South Africa could have consumed compared with the amount actually available as represented by the apparent consumption shown in table 22.

Consumption of gasoline by passenger motor vehicles
in use in selected countries

1972

	Passenger vehicle in thousand units	Kilometres <u>a/</u> run per vehicle	Gasoline <u>a/</u> consumed in thousand tons	Consumption per vehicle in tons	Total apparent <u>b/</u> consumption in thousand tons
Belgium-Lux.	2,300	N.A.	2,680	1.16	2,994
Denmark	1,206	16,210	1,566 <u>c/</u>	1.30	2,107 <u>c/</u>
Finland	818	17,115	1,075	1.31	1,166
France	13,900	N.A.	14,522	1.04	15,511
Germany, FR	15,615	N.A.	17,950	1.15	17,659
Italy	12,484	12,441	10,522	0.82	10,826
Netherlands	3,050	16,059	3,418	1.12	3,460
Norway	854	10,566	902	1.06	1,082
Portugal	697	N.A.	580	0.83	676
Sweden	2,458	15,033	2,923	1.19	2,954
Switzerland	1,567	N.A.	2,416	1.54 <u>d/</u>	2,569
United Kingdom	12,881	14,306	15,898	1.28	15,810
South Africa					
Customs Union	1,664	N.A.	2,500 E	1.50 E	2,867
Angola	116	N.A.	134 E	1.06	134
Mozambique	85	N.A.	90 E	1.16	90

E = Estimate.

a/ Survey results by the Economic Commission for Europe.

b/ Derived from production and imports less exports and bunkers.

c/ The consumption in agriculture of 100,000 tons explains a part of the discrepancy shown here.

d/ The exceptionally high figure is probably due to a disproportionate amount of tourist vehicles from abroad.

43. It will be noted that in table 23 passenger motor vehicles in use is used to relate gasoline consumption. The reason is that few passenger vehicles using diesel fuel are in use in Europe nor are commercial gasoline vehicles popular. There is no doubt that gasoline is mostly consumed by passenger vehicles in Europe and only very marginally by other types of road vehicles.

44. As indicated in table 23 above the amount of gasoline which S. Africa Customs Union could possibly have consumed in 1972 would have been about 2.5 million tons, which would mean 1.5 tons consumed by each vehicle. This per-vehicle consumption is perhaps too high in view of the fact that most European countries had much lower figures. There is no reason to believe that the average passenger motor vehicle in South Africa was larger or the vehicles in South Africa travelled

longer distances or were used more extensively. Nevertheless even with this high per-vehicle consumption, South Africa would still have over one third of 1 million tons of surplus gasoline (apparent consumption 2,867,000 tons less estimated consumption of 2,500,000 tons) for stock and supply to Southern Rhodesia.

45. Turning to the fuel oil requirements of Southern Rhodesia, no detailed analysis similar to the one made above for gasoline is possible because the end uses of fuel oils are numerous and background data for various consumers (mostly different types of industries) are lacking. However a casual glance at the following figures on the amounts of available fuel oils for consumption in 1965, 1972 and 1973 in the South Africa Customs Union and some selected industrialized countries will convince the reader that South Africa had ample stock to satisfy the requirements of Southern Rhodesia which probably would only amount to less than 300,000 tons per annum (165,000 tons in 1965).

Table 24

Apparent consumption of fuel oils
(in thousand tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1972 as % of 1965</u>	<u>1973 as % of 1965</u>
South Africa	2,166	5,637	4,433	260	205
USA	187,319	279,986	299,946	149	160
W. Europe	239,183	427,497	457,043	179	191
Germany, F.R.	51,756	93,843	102,423	181	198
United Kingdom	44,066	61,449	61,819	139	140
Sweden	14,042	21,592	21,488	154	153
Japan	50,336	139,323	161,402	277	321

46. The consumption of fuel oils has a high correlation with the growth of industry. Since there is no reason to believe that the rate of industrialization in South Africa was second only to Japan in recent years, the high rate of the availability of fuel oil for consumption in South Africa could only mean that an ample stock of this fuel was being accumulated. Some of the stock could certainly have been supplied to Southern Rhodesia to more than amply meet its requirements.

47. Southern Rhodesia's requirements per year for other types of petroleum products are small: 70-100,000 tons of kerosene, 15-20,000 tons of lubricating oils and 13-15,000 tons of lubricating greases. In the years prior to the introduction of the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, South Africa exported no significant amount of kerosene. However in the years 1966-1968 it recorded in its trade returns an average of 40,000 tons per year, most of which were probably sent to Southern Rhodesia. Since then the recorded exports were drastically reduced to less than 10,000 tons per annum, possibly for the purpose of avoiding any implication or suspicion that South Africa was sending kerosene to Southern Rhodesia. In any case because of South Africa's more than adequate refining

capacity, to satisfy the small requirement for kerosene of Southern Rhodesia is not a matter of any serious concern. As to lubricating oils and greases, South Africa has been the traditional supplier of Southern Rhodesia's needs and there is no reason to believe that any significant change in the situation has taken place.

48. In summarizing the somewhat elaborate analysis given above regarding how Southern Rhodesia's needs for petroleum products were met, it becomes evident that, aside from a marginal amount that Mozambique was able to supply, South Africa probably furnished the bulk of the petroleum products. It has been reported that "Southern Rhodesia has been purchasing oil and petroleum products from the Republic of South Africa through its purchasing agency, GENTA" h/ (see A/AC.109/L.445, para. 99). These Rhodesian purchases presumably were not recorded in any official trade returns.

Other commodities

49. In evaluating the import pattern of Southern Rhodesian trade for the periods following the application of economic sanctions, it is not possible to give a commodity analysis as comprehensive as that for its export pattern for the reason that Southern Rhodesia's exports are concentrated in a few primary commodities, but its imports are much more diversified. For instance, the export commodities discussed in this paper accounted for 59 per cent of total Southern Rhodesian exports in 1965, but the four import commodities referred to in paragraph 32 accounted for only 16 per cent of total Southern Rhodesian imports in 1965. Furthermore, with the prevailing severe restrictions on the publication of external trade and other related statistics imposed by Southern Rhodesia, as well as, to a lesser degree, by South Africa, attempts at making meaningful evaluations of Southern Rhodesia's import commodities, other than those discussed in the foregoing paragraphs, have proven to be fruitless.

h/ GENTA is the code name of an agency established by the illegal régime to purchase petroleum and petroleum products from South Africa and to control its distribution in Southern Rhodesia.

Appendix I

IMPORTS OF ALL COMMODITIES FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA*
(AS REPORTED BY COUNTRIES LISTED)

(in thousands of US dollars)

<u>Importing country or area</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Angola	612 ^{a/}	689	1 137	374 ^{d/}	-	-	-	-	-	-
Argentina	377	62	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Australia	3 266	787	60	74	1	1	-	-	-	20
Austria	4 436	1 673	249	95	26	-	-	-	-	-
Barbados	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium-Lux.	2 806	3 540	1 998	829	477	142	97	10	4	2
Botswana	5 432	N.A.	826 ^{h/}	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Brazil	55 ^{a/}	62	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Canada	3 152	1 087	4	2	1	1	1	5	3	7
Chile	4 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Colombia	185	230	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	398	260	2	2	1	1	1	-	-	-
Denmark	1 244	1 205	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Egypt	1 241	189	1	12	94	-	2	3	-	-
Ethiopia	-	15	149	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fiji	222	125	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Finland	845	290	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
France ^{b/}	2 873	1 856	1 059	1 171	50	61	130	907 ^{b/}	215	-
Germany, Fed.	35 112	30 525	15 966	13 298	1 120	572	485	367	521	479
Ghana	297	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greece	2 581 ^{a/}	5 644 ^{a/}	677 ^{a/f/}	-	-	-	10	-	-	-
Guyana	168	127	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Hong Kong	2 313	2 082	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
India	6 503	166	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iran	244 ^{a/}	156	129	-	57	37	6	-	3	122
Ireland	967	142	70	32	4	-	-	-	10	-
Israel	82 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	16 666	8 554	259	138	27	59	2	9	13	124
Ivory Coast	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.	N.A.
Jamaica	566 ^{a/}	456	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Japan	26 497	13 781	1 266	822	-	-	20	-	-	-
Jordan	-	470	201	20	11	-	-	-	-	-
Korea, Rep.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lao P.D. Rep.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix I (continued)

<u>Importing country or area</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Lebanon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Liberia	5	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Libyan Arab Rep.	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malawi ^{i/}	20 805	17 267	14 732	12 588	12 534	18 606	16 101	21 167	21 278	24 066
Malaysia, West	3 569 ^{a/}	1 123	5	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.	N.A.
Malta	217	88	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mauritius	242	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mexico	2 ^{a/}	-	-	-	1 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Mozambique	2 991	5 862	4 458	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Netherlands	5 987	5 722	2 406	542	136	21	2	-	259	-
Neth. Antilles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Zealand	1 178	999	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigeria	1 017 ^{a/}	507 ^{a/}	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	1 713	664	18	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Pakistan	291 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	124 ^{a/}	335 ^{a/}	58 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	2 927 ^{a/}	2 148	5 635	3 582 ^{c/}	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Sarawak	11 ^{a/}	2 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Senegal	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Singapore	2 109 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S. Vietnam RP	-	-	-	78 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Spain	3 543	2 288	156	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	87	79	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	1 920	182	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Switzerland ^{d/}	5 678	4 155	3 925 ^{e/}	3 483 ^{e/}	3 625 ^{e/}	4 296 ^{e/}	4 511 ^{e/}	4 582 ^{e/}	7 749 ^{e/}	7 352 ^{e/}
Thailand	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Trinidad TBG	389	360	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tunisia	236 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uganda	561	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	33 711	12 809	405	215	163	117	129	222	147	247
United States	14 056 ^{a/}	9 359	6 463	1 599	68	115	807	12 400	25 670	19 415
Western Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yugoslavia	677 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zambia	99 507	64 904	45 129	31 602	30 481	30 481	28 864	29 580	16 181	12 014

(Foot-notes on following page)

Appendix I (continued)

(Foot-notes to appendix I)

* Exports to the countries listed accounted for approximately 86 per cent of the total exports of Southern Rhodesia in 1965.

a/ Refers to trade with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

b/ Merchandise trade excludes capital transfers (e.g., movement of monetary gold) between monetary authorities of Governments. Although transactions in non-monetary gold (gold bought or sold by parties other than monetary authorities) should be included in merchandise trade, the current practice of most countries is to exclude from their external trade statistics all forms of gold except those constituting parts of made-up articles, such as jewellery, in which the value of the gold content is less than 80 per cent. However, it should be noted that significant amounts of non-monetary gold are exported by Southern Rhodesia each year (e.g., \$16.4 million in 1970, \$17.9 million in 1971 and \$25.5 million in 1972). According to Statistiques du Commerce Extérieur de La France published by the Direction Générale des Douanes et Droits Indirects, France imported gold for industrial purposes from Southern Rhodesia in 1970 (\$2.3 million); these imports increased to \$17.9 million in 1971, \$19.8 million in 1972; for the years 1965-1969, there was no evidence of such imports, nor for the year 1973.

c/ January-June.

d/ See the official declaration of the Swiss Government contained in document S/7781, annex II.

e/ "The Swiss importer is authorized to make use of his yearly quota any time of the year, e.g., in the early months of the year 1967. The quotas are compounded on the basis of the average import quantity of the commodity during the previous three years. Fluctuations are furthermore possible between the years, as the use of a yearly quota requested in December may only appear in the trade statistics of the first three months of the following year, the reason being that the import licenses granted within the quota are generally valid for three months."

f/ January-February.

g/ March-December.

h/ January-September.

i/ Prior to 1971, figures are on a f.o.b. basis.

j/ January-May.

Appendix II

EXPORTS OF ALL COMMODITIES TO SOUTHERN RHODESIA*
(AS REPORTED BY COUNTRIES LISTED)

(in thousands of US dollars)

<u>Exporting country or area</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Angola	304 ^{a/}	154	214	65 ^{e/}	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Argentina	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Australia	4 510	4 072	5 653	5 851	3 539	4 937	4 840	4 060	25	29
Austria	800	1 256	1 252	1 082	87	-	-	-	-	-
Barbados	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium-Lux.	6 832	3 444	1 922	1 312	139	82	51	41	181	138
Brazil	86 ^{a/}	20	24	13	4	-	-	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Canada	3 625	575	89	22	2	16	-	17	3	2
Chile	2 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colombia	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Cyprus	5	3	4	1	1	1	1	-	-	-
Denmark	667	31	37	29	29	31	19	37	60	99
Egypt	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Fiji	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	N.A.
Finland	492	14	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-
France	3 850	4 246	3 976	2 380	200	286	337	488	451	186
Germany, Fed.	10 903	11 186	12 305	12 914	1 234	1 176	1 552	2 004	2 229	2 615
Ghana	17	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greece	63 ^{a/}	19 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guyana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Hong Kong	1 328	318	139	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iceland	-	-	1 ^{a/}	1 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-
India	4 526	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iran	2 821 ^{a/}	3	-	-	-	41	69	1	20	-
Ireland	37	9	31	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Israel	1 482 ^{a/}	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	6 318	5 010	1 339	1 295	73	63	21	42	127	252
Ivory Coast	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.	N.A.
Jamaica	2 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Japan	16 184	11 110	13 597	4 525	4	4	6	20	36	84
Jordan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Korea, Rep.	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lao P.D. Rep.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.

Appendix II (continued)

<u>Exporting country or area</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Liberia	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Libyan Arab Rep.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malawi	4 359	2 951	2 735	2 872	3 804	5 017	5 267	5 755	7 183	8 440
Malaysia, West	618 ^{a/}	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Malta	9	5	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mauritius	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mexico	207 ^{a/}	40 ^{a/}	103 ^{a/}	58 ^{a/}	6 ^{a/}	-	-	-	1	N.A.
Mozambique	3 247	2 698	3 818	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Netherlands	7 291	5 748	4 699	3 000	57	278	255	261	259	17
Neth. Antilles	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Zealand	237 ^{d/}	37 ^{d/}	7	12 ^{d/}	18 ^{d/}	-	-	2	-	1
Nigeria	129 ^{a/}	1 823 ^{a/}	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	1 527	760	183	1	1	-	1	-	1	-
Pakistan	448 ^{a/}	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	2 ^{a/}	26 ^{a/}	3 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	1	39	-
Portugal	559 ^{a/}	1 055	1 824	878 ^{b/}	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Sarawak	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Senegal	309 ^{a/}	122	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Singapore	1 217 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S. Vietnam RP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N.A.
Spain	193	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	288	-	-	-	-	25	-	N.A.	-	-
Sweden	3 413	51	1	-	2	-	-	-	3	-
Switzerland ^{c/}	1 641	1 890	1 939	2 513	1 540	1 969	2 851	3 230	3 834	4 546
Thailand	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trinidad TBG	7	4	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tunisia	15 ^{a/}	26 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkey	2 ^{a/}	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uganda	412	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	38 808	7 648	2 877	1 946	1 958	1 206	1 698	1 796	1 947	1 945
United States	22 982 ^{a/}	7 491	3 757	2 024	455	514	652	700	581	853
Western Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yugoslavia	16 ^{a/}	81 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zambia	15 317	7 018	2 850	1 332	613	506	738	459	1 504	526

* Imports from the countries listed above accounted for approximately 75 per cent of the total imports of Southern Rhodesia in 1965.

^{a/} Refers to trade with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

^{b/} January-June.

^{c/} See the official declaration of the Swiss Government contained in document S/7781, annex II.

^{d/} Domestic exports.

^{e/} January-May.

(a) EXTERNAL TRADE OF SOUTH AFRICA (CUSTOMS UNION)

TOBACCO

(in metric tons)

A: Imports reported by partner countries or areas
 B: Exports reported by South Africa (Customs Union)
 C: Imports less exports

	1965			1971			1972			1973 a/		1974 a/	
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	A	A	
AUSTRALIA	1 780E	1 815	-35	746	738	8	473	533	-60	400	-	-	
AUSTRIA	-	-	-	218	-	218	657	-	657	611	483	-	
BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG	53	-	53	866	-	866	810	310	500	952	566	-	
CANADA	-	-	-	15	16	-1	2	-	2	-	31	-	
DENMARK	4	-	4	402	-	402	5	-	5	-	0	-	
FINLAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	159	-	159	-	105	-	
FRANCE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43	-43	-	911	-	
GERMANY, FED. REP.	4	-	4	929	76	853	881	-	881	2 216	506	-	
GREECE	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	-	24	-	-	-	
HONG KONG	29	-	29	-	-	-	28	-	28	215	-	-	
IRELAND	103	22	81	217	602	-385	131	140	-9	421	359	-	
ISRAEL	-	-	-	983	-	983	1 393	80	1 313	1 454	1 644	-	
ITALY	-	30	-30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
JAPAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	587	1 199	-	
JORDAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	306	6	-	
NETHERLANDS	2 281	1 901	380	7 743	2 392	5 351	8 447	3 315	5 132	8 295	6 501	-	
NEW ZEALAND	220	138	82	-	75	-75	75	-	75	-	-	-	
NORWAY	-	-	-	355	-	355	549	-	549	-	510	-	
PORTUGAL	20	-	20	45	-	45	9	-	9	403	-	-	
SPAIN	20	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SWEDEN	-	-	-	437	45	392	45	60	-15	-	63	-	
SWITZERLAND	9	-	9	278	-	278	371	-	371	385	181	-	
UNITED KINGDOM	3 521	3 489	32	5 223	5 076	147	4 848	5 419	-571	5 572	3 611	-	
UNITED STATES	-	-	-	75	-	75	98	-	98	-	-	-	
OTHERS	400	234	166	69	84	-15	-	351	-351	-	-	-	
TOTAL	8 444	7 629	815	18 601	9 104	9 497	19 005	10 251	8 754	21 817	16 676	-	

E = estimate.

e/ No details of South Africa exports by direction are available. Total exports for 1973 and 1974 are estimated to be 10,000 and 10,800 metric tons respectively.

Appendix III (continued)

(b) EXTERNAL TRADE OF MOZAMBIQUE

TOBACCO

(in metric tons)

A: Imports reported by partner countries or areas
 B: Exports reported by Mozambique
 C: Imports less exports

	1965			1971			1972			1973			1974		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
ANGOLA	-	120	-120	193	110	83	158	-	158	-	62	-62	-	148	-148
AUSTRALIA	-	-	-	124	-	124	178	-	178	-	-	178	-	251	251
AUSTRIA	-	-	-	197	-	197	1 404	-	1 404	-	-	1 262	-	216	216
BELGIUM-LUX.	4	-	4	2 773	-	2 773	3 743	-	3 743	-	-	4 430	-	4 832	4 807
DENMARK	-	-	-	515	-	515	937	-	937	-	-	1 847	-	1 508	1 508
FRANCE	-	-	-	645	85	560	904	577	327	706	39	706	1 433	1 433	1 433
GERMANY, FED.	-	-	-	1 042	-	1 042	2 201	75	2 126	2 349	35	2 349	1 716	1 647	1 647
GUINEA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	121	-121	-131	131	-131	-	30	-30
HONG KONG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	106	-	106	-	83	83
IRELAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	131	-	131	92	-	92	314	87	227
ISRAEL	-	-	-	-	5	-5	133	-	133	-	-	-	-	-	-
MALAWI	-	-	-	-	-	-	56	-	56	-	53	-53	-	-	-
MALAYSIA, WEST	-	-	-	660	-	660	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MALTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NETHERLANDS	1 118	-	1 118	5 947	82	5 865	6 698	75	6 623	18E	-	18	-	-	-
NORWAY	-	-	-	501	-	501	972	-	972	8 167	214	7 953	9 104	148	8 956
PORTUGAL	513	696	-183	548	820	-272	627	1 577 ^{a/}	-950	1 365	-	1 365	1 604	-	1 604
PORT. GUINEA	-	-	-	-	158	-158	-	-	-	1 157	1 236	-79	1 349	1 025	324
SINGAPORE	-	-	-	439	-	439	-	-	-	212	-	212	-	-	-
SPAIN	-	-	-	18	-	18	-	-	-	212	-	212	-	-	-
SWEDEN	-	-	-	198	-	198	164	-	164	151	-	151	133	-	133
SWITZERLAND	-	-	-	333	-	333	485	-	485	159	-	159	66	-	66
UNITED KINGDOM	-	-	-	-	-	-	485	-	485	571	-	571	454	-	454
UNITED STATES	-	-	-	440	-	440	489	-	489	928	-	928	393	-	393
OTHERS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-4	346	-	346
TOTAL	1 635	816	819	14 573	1 260	13 313	19 280	2 425	16 855	23 772	1 774	21 998	23 802	1 532	22 270

E = estimate.

a/ Including adjacent islands.

Appendix III (continued)

(c) EXTERNAL TRADE OF ANGOLA

TOBACCO

(in metric tons)

A: Imports reported by partner countries or areas
 B: Exports reported by Angola
 C: Imports less exports

	1965			1971			1972			1973			1974		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
AUSTRIA	-	-	-	50	80	-30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BELGIUM-LUX.	2	-	2	268	-	268	449	-	-	449	-	-	120	-	281
DENMARK	-	-	-	113	35	76	739	-	-	739	-	-	15	26	-11
FINLAND	-	-	-	389	-	389	597	434	305	597	434	305	668	953	-285
GERMANY, FED.	21	25	-4	1 352	51	1 352	1 233	-	1 233	597	106	943	66	-	66
HONG KONG	-	-	-	294	47	224	1 049	70	224	1 049	106	943	601	1 383	-782
IRELAND	-	-	-	306	-	306	320	-	320	343	1 315	320	546	-	546
ITALY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 313	585	728
JAPAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MOZAMBIQUE	-	91	-91	106	-	106	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	-39
NETHERLANDS	-	3	-3	228	-	228	239	-	239	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEW ZEALAND	-	-	-	81	-	81	239	-	239	-	-	-	-	-	-
PORTUGAL	1 309	1 422	-113	1 090	1 364	-274	1 291	1 192	-228	1 291	1 147	144	1 168	794	374
SPAIN	660	801	-141	139	47	19	98	252	24	154	21	154	207	195	12
SWEDEN	-	-	-	279	-	279	264	-	42	264	3 411	154	21	-	21
UNITED KINGDOM	-	-	-	273	290	-17	264	283	42	264	58	-807	2 282	1 742	540
UNITED STATES	-	-	-	25	45	-20	-	-	-	-	84	-58	41	33	8
ZAIRE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37	-37	-	84	-84	-	58	-58
OTHERS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37	-37	-	-	-
TOTAL	1 992	2 342	-350	4 109	1 812	2 297	7 883	6 844	1 039	7 883	6 844	1 039	7 048	6 089	959

Appendix IV

(a) EXTERNAL TRADE OF SOUTH AFRICA (CUSTOMS UNION)

ASBESTOS

(in thousand metric tons)

A: Imports reported by partner countries or areas
 B: Exports reported by South Africa (Customs Union)
 C: Imports less exports

	1965			1971			1972			1973 ^a			1974		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
ARGENTINA	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.1	3.9	4.2	4.1	7.0	4.2	4.1	7.0	4.2
AUSTRALIA	7.5	7.7	-0.2	6.0	8.7	-2.7	7.0	7.5	-0.5	7.6	7.9	-0.5	7.6	7.9	-0.5
AUSTRIA	0.8	0.4	0.4	7.7	3.5	4.2	7.2	1.4	5.8	7.1	4.9	5.8	7.1	4.9	5.8
BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG	7.8	9.4	-1.6	12.7	10.4	2.3	9.1	11.9	-2.8	12.4	10.1	-2.8	12.4	10.1	-2.8
BRAZIL	1.5	1.6	-0.1	2.0E	1.5	0.5	-	1.3	-1.3	5.0	10.4	-1.3	5.0	10.4	-1.3
CANADA	4.8	4.4	0.4	4.6	4.6	-	4.4	4.7	-0.3	3.3	3.2	-0.3	3.3	3.2	-0.3
CHILE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	0.6	1.3	-1.2	0.6	1.3	-1.2	0.6
COLOMBIA	0.9	1.5	-0.6	1.0E	0.8	0.2	3.0	1.0	2.0	3.9	-	2.0	3.9	-	2.0
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	6.2	7.8	-1.6	4.3	11.3	-7.0	5.1	0.9	-0.9	7.1	4.4	-0.9	7.1	4.4	-0.9
DENMARK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.0	-10.9	-	-	-10.9	-	-	-10.9
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-0.1	-	-	-0.1	-	-	-0.1
EGYPT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FINLAND	1.4	1.4	-	1.0	1.1	-0.1	1.2	0.3	0.9	4.0	2.0	0.9	4.0	2.0	0.9
FRANCE	6.4	7.2	-0.8	15.7	13.6	2.1	17.0	12.9	4.1	18.8	18.6	4.1	18.8	18.6	4.1
GERMANY, FED. REP. OF	13.1	9.7	3.4	29.0	7.2	21.8	22.4	5.5	16.9	21.9	24.2	16.9	21.9	24.2	16.9
GREECE	2.3	2.7	0.4	6.3	4.5	1.8	2.3	1.1	1.2	3.7	5.3	1.2	3.7	5.3	1.2
INDIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	1.1	-	0.7	1.1	-
IRAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.5	6.0	5.0
IRELAND	1.5	0.6	0.9	1.6	4.3	-2.7	1.2	2.2	-1.0	1.7	1.0	-1.0	1.7	1.0	-1.0
ISRAEL	2.0	1.5	0.5	2.2	1.7	0.5	1.7	2.3	-0.6	1.8	1.6	-0.6	1.8	1.6	-0.6
ITALY	15.1	16.6	-1.5	33.5	21.4	12.1	22.7	17.1	5.6	31.3	29.1	5.6	31.3	29.1	5.6
JAPAN	26.3	27.1	-0.8	99.5	65.3	34.2	100.2	63.2	37.0	112.2	124.1	37.0	112.2	124.1	37.0
KOREA, DEM. P. REP.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-0.2	-	-	-0.2	-	-	-0.2
KOREA, REPUBLIC OF	-	-	-	-	-	-	16.2	8.7	7.5	27.0	28.2	7.5	27.0	28.2	7.5
LEBANON	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.2	-	-	4.2	-	-
MEXICO	0.5E	1.7	-1.2	6.4E	4.4	2.0	5.0E	5.5	-0.5	7.9	5.0E	-0.5	7.9	5.0E	-0.5
NETHERLANDS	1.2	3.5	-2.3	0.3	3.1	-2.8	0.8	3.2	-2.4	1.1	0.4	-2.4	1.1	0.4	-2.4
NEW ZEALAND	1.3	2.1	-0.8	1.2	1.6	-0.4	1.3	0.9	0.4	1.5	1.0	0.4	1.5	1.0	0.4
NORWAY	1.5	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.2	-	0.3	0.3	-	-	0.0	-	-	0.0	-
POLAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.2	-3.2	-	-	-3.2	-	-	-3.2

Appendix IV (continued)

(a) EXTERNAL TRADE OF SOUTH AFRICA (CUSTOMS UNION) (continued)

ASBESTOS (continued)

(in thousand metric tons)

	1965			1971			1972			1973 ^{a/}			1974		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
PORTUGAL	1.2	1.3	-0.1	1.4	1.5	-0.1	1.3	1.1	0.2	1.8	2.1	0.2	1.8	2.1	0.2
ROMANIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.3	-5.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPAIN	16.6	10.9	5.7	32.1	8.8	23.3	34.4	10.7	23.7	50.9	50.4	23.7	50.9	50.4	23.7
SRI LANKA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	-0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
SWEDEN	0.2	1.1	-0.9	0.1	0.6	-0.5	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	0.7	-
SWITZERLAND	1.4	0.2	1.2	4.4	0.3	4.1	3.3	1.0	2.3	4.9	3.2	2.3	4.9	3.2	2.3
THAILAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19.7	28.0	-	19.7	28.0	-
TURKEY	-	1.0	-1.0	1.0E	2.2	-1.2	1.0	2.1	-1.1	1.1	-	-1.1	1.1	-	-1.1
UNITED KINGDOM	42.2	45.4	-3.2	45.4	46.8	-1.4	46.2	55.1	-8.9	52.3	52.0	-8.9	52.3	52.0	-8.9
UNITED STATES	36.7	39.5	-2.8	23.1	23.6	-0.5	14.9	17.8	-2.9	23.0	21.9	-2.9	23.0	21.9	-2.9
VENEZUELA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	-0.6	-	-	-0.6	-	-	-0.6
YUGOSLAVIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.3	-	7.3	7.7	10.8	7.3	7.7	10.8	7.3
OTHERS	0.5	-	0.5	8.4	0.7	7.7	4.3	3.7	0.6	8.8	-	0.6	8.8	-	0.6
TOTAL	200.9	206.9	-6.0	351.1	253.7	97.4	353.9	274.0	79.9	467.0	445.8	79.9	467.0	445.8	79.9

E = estimate.

a/ No details of South Africa's exports by direction are available. Total exports for 1973 and 1974 are estimated to be 350,000 and 250,000 metric tons respectively.

Appendix IV (continued)

(b) EXTERNAL TRADE OF MOZAMBIQUE

ASBESTOS

(in metric tons)

A: Imports reported by partner countries or areas
 B: Exports reported by Mozambique
 C: Imports less exports

	1965			1971			1972 ^{a/}			1973 ^{a/}			1974 ^{a/}		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	C	A	A	A	A	A	A	
ARGENTINA	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
AUSTRIA	18	-	18	735	-	735	405	735	7125	405	7125	38	735	38	
BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG	82	-	82	833	-	833	2 341	833	-	2 341	-	7 907	833	7 907	
EGYPT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 300	-	1 300	-	-	-	
FRANCE	532	-	532	-	50	-50	-	-50	-	-	-	228	-	228	
GERMANY, FEDERAL	-	-	-	62	147	-85	-	-85	3 279	-	3 279	5 860	-	5 860	
IRELAND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 480	-	1 480	
ITALY	192	2	190	268	40	228	888	228	-	888	-	230	228	230	
JAPAN	110	-	110	55	-	55	535	55	-	535	-	2 006	55	2 006	
KOREA, REPUBLIC OF	-	-	-	1 647	-	1 647	1 301	1 647	-	1 301	-	-	1 647	-	
MALAYSIA (WEST)	1 308	-	1 308	99	-	99	-	99	-	-	-	-	99	-	
NETHERLANDS	961	-	961	1 088	-	1 088	784	1 088	1 121	784	1 121	216	1 088	216	
PORTUGAL	175	-	175	439	-	439	482	439	836	482	836	870	439	870	
SPAIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	50	
SWITZERLAND	27	-	27	19	-	19	-	19	-	-	-	-	19	-	
UNITED KINGDOM	46	105	-59	228	-	228	-	228	-	-	-	-	228	-	
UNITED STATES	54	39	15	349	-	349	930	349	-	930	-	-	349	-	
OTHERS	-	-	-	240	22	218	341	218	310	341	310	-	218	-	
TOTAL	3 505	146	3 359	6 063	259	5 804	8 007	5 804	13 971	8 007	13 971	18 885	8 007	18 885	

a/ No data for Mozambique's exports of asbestos are available.

Appendix V

(a) EXTERNAL TRADE OF SOUTH AFRICA (CUSTOMS UNION)

CHROME ORE
(in thousand metric tons)

A: Imports reported by partner countries or areas
B: Exports reported by South Africa (Customs Union)
C: Imports less exports

	1965			1971			1972			1973 ^{a/}		1974 ^{a/}	
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	A	A	
ARGENTINA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.2	-	
AUSTRALIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	1.1	
AUSTRIA	-	-	-	29.4	-	29.4	12.4	-	12.4	24.5	55.2	55.2	
BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG	0.2	-	0.2	7.5	13.4	-5.9	-	3.1	-3.1	-	1.0	1.0	
BRAZIL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	-1.1	-	1.7	-	
CANADA	2.7	-	2.7	2.3	5.1	-2.8	2.0	12.2	-10.2	-	2.4	2.4	
DENMARK	-	-	-	0.5	-	0.5	1.2	-	1.2	-	1.1	1.1	
FINLAND	-	-	-	1.6	1.6	-	-	0.9	-0.9	-	0.1	0.1	
FRANCE	4.0	-	4.0	29.7	22.0	7.7	20.6	14.4	6.2	56.2	61.9	61.9	
GERMANY, FEDERAL	117.6	68.2	49.4	273.3	158.0	115.3	193.5	128.1	65.4	177.0	175.6	175.6	
IRELAND	-	7.8	-7.8	-	11.6	-11.6	-	4.5	-4.5	-	-	-	
ITALY	3.2	3.5	-0.3	22.6	49.0	-26.4	19.2	17.3	1.9	20.5	24.8	24.8	
JAPAN	52.2	109.2	-57.0	719.6	355.4	364.2	445.3	253.1	192.2	619.3	423.7	423.7	
MEXICO	-	3.1	-3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
NETHERLANDS	0.3	45.6	-45.3	3.0	64.3	-61.3	-	72.5	-72.5	-	13.4	13.4	
NORWAY	-	-	-	0.2	0.6	-0.4	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	
SPAIN	12.8	11.7	1.1	40.4	19.7	20.7	20.5	16.5	4.0	33.4	6.9	6.9	
SWEDEN	16.9	34.2	-17.3	6.3	5.7	0.6	5.6	5.7	-0.1	3.0	4.9	4.9	
SWITZERLAND	-	-	-	4.4	-	4.4	3.5	-	3.5	3.1	4.2	4.2	
UNITED KINGDOM	68.8	92.8	-24.0	94.0	117.4	-23.4	48.1	54.0	-5.9	102.6	45.2	45.2	
UNITED STATES	436.2	395.7	40.5	382.7	376.9	5.8	238.0	284.2	-46.2	244.4	257.5	257.5	
ZAMBIA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	
OTHERS	-	4.2	-4.2	-	8.9	-8.9	-	4.0	-4.0	-	-	-	
TOTAL	714.9	776.0	-61.1	1 617.5	1 209.6	407.9	1 009.9	871.6	138.3	1 290.8	1 079.1	1 079.1	

E = estimate.

^{a/} No details of South Africa's exports by direction are available. Total exports for 1973 and 1974 are estimated to be 1,145.0 and 760.0 thousand tons respectively.

Appendix V (continued)

(b) EXTERNAL TRADE OF MOZAMBIQUE^{a/}

CHROME ORE

Imports reported by partner countries
(in metric tons)

	1965	1971	1972	1973	1974
BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG	-	-	-	534	730
BRAZIL	-	-	-	50	-
CANADA	-	-	3 069	-	-
FRANCE	38	7 080	9 728	1 366	6
GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF	-	-	-	80 422	7 397
IRELAND	-	-	-	-	6 330
JAPAN	2 865	-	-	-	-
NETHERLANDS	1 093	975	2 845	-	6 447
SWITZERLAND	938	-	-	-	-
UNITED KINGDOM	14 924	11 489	2 679	-	30 693
TOTAL	19 858	19 544	18 321	82 372	51 603

^{a/} No exports of chrome ore have been reported by Mozambique.

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.
