



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

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

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

Volume II

**UNITED NATIONS
New York, 1977**

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/12265

Annexes

EXPLANATORY NOTE

General information on the cases

1. The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth reports of the Committee to the Security Council contained texts of reports and substantive parts of correspondence with Governments on 286 cases concerning suspected violation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Those reports were published as follows:

- First report: Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1968, document S/8954, paragraph 9
- Second report: Ibid., Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1969, document S/9252/Add.1, annex XI
- Third report: Ibid., Twenty-fifth Year, Special Supplement No. 3 (S/9844/Rev.1), annex VII
- Fourth report: Ibid., Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2), annexes I-III
- Fifth report: Ibid., Twenty-seventh Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/10852/Rev.1), annexes I-III
- Sixth report: Ibid., Twenty-ninth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/11178/Rev.1), annexes I-IV
- Seventh report: Ibid., Thirtieth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/11594/Rev.1), annexes II-V
- Eighth report: Ibid., Thirty-first Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/11927/Rev.1), annexes II-V

2. Annexes I to V to the present report contain additional information received by the Committee on 74 of the cases previously reported, together with the texts of reports and substantive parts of correspondence with Governments received up to and including 15 December 1975 concerning 60 new cases brought to the Committee's attention since submission of the eighth report.* The 60 new cases include 6 cases opened from information supplied by the United States in its quarterly reports to the Committee and 5 cases opened from information supplied by individuals and non-governmental organizations.

* This is the correct number of the new cases opened during the period under review and referred to originally as 58 in para. 22 in vol. I of the present report, which should be amended accordingly.

3. As indicated in the eighth report, nine cases of suspected violation of sanctions were closed during 1975 and a tenth case was similarly closed in 1973. Consequently, those cases, described below, have been dropped from the list of cases currently under consideration by the Committee.

- Case No. 131 Sugar - "Mariner"
- Case No. 150 Cotton corduroy - "Straat Nagasaki"
- Case No. 152 Textiles - "Ise Maru" and "Acapulco Maru"
- Case No. 161 Electric generating equipment
- Case No. 164 Tobacco - "Mexico Maru"
- Case No. 169 Tobacco - "Adelaide Maru"
- Case No. 177 Machine tools
- Case No. 184 Nickel - "Kungshamn"
- Case No. 187 Crushed coking oil
- Case No. 200 Publication of a tourist guide to Southern Rhodesia

4. As of 15 December 1976, the cumulative number of cases on the Committee's list had reached 346. However, excluding the two reclassifications mentioned in the seventh report, the nine cases closed in 1975, the five cases closed in 1974, the five cases closed in 1973 and the eight cases closed in 1972, the number of cases which were under consideration by the Committee during 1976 totals 317.

COMPLETE LIST OF CASES CURRENTLY UNDER CONSIDERATION

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

A. METALLIC ORES, METALS AND THEIR ALLOYS

Ferro-chrome and chrome ores

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(1)	1	Chrome sand - <u>Tjibodas</u> : United Kingdom note dated 20 December 1968
(2)	3	Chrome sand - <u>Tjipondok</u> : United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1969
(3)	5	Trade in chrome ore and ferro-chrome: United Kingdom note dated 6 February 1969
(4)	6	Ferro-chrome - <u>Blue Sky</u> : United Kingdom note dated 12 February 1969
(5)	7	Ferro-chrome - <u>Catharina Oldendorff</u> : United Kingdom note dated 22 February 1969
(6)	11	Ferro-chrome - <u>Al Mubarakiah</u> and <u>Al Sabahiah</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1969
(7)	17	Ferro-chrome - <u>Gasikara</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 June 1969
(8)	23	Ferro-chrome - <u>Massimoemee</u> and <u>Archon</u> : United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1969
(9)	25	Ferro-chrome - <u>Batu</u> : United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969
(10)	31	Chrome ore and ferro-chrome - <u>Ville de Nantes</u> : United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969
(11)	36	Ferro-chrome - <u>Ioannis</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 August 1969
(12)	37	Ferro-chrome - <u>Halleren</u> : United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(13)	40	Ferro-chrome - <u>Ville de Reims</u> : United Kingdom note dated 29 August 1969
(14)	45	Ferro-chrome - <u>Tai Sun</u> and <u>Kyotai Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 20 September 1969
(15)	55	Ferro-chrome - <u>Guvnor</u> : United Kingdom note dated 10 November 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(16)	57	Chrome ore - <u>Myrtidiotissa</u> : United Kingdom note dated 17 November 1969
(17)	59	Shipments of ferro-chrome to various countries: United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969
(18)	64	Chrome ore and ferro-chrome -- <u>Birte Oldendorff</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969
(19)	71	Ferro-chrome - <u>Disa</u> : United Kingdom note dated 2 April 1970
(20)	73	Chrome ores - <u>Selene</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 April 1970
(21)	74	Chrome ore and concentrates - <u>Castasegna</u> : United Kingdom note dated 17 April 1970
(22)	76	Ferro-chrome - <u>Hodakasan Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1970
(23)	79	Chrome ore - <u>Schutting</u> : United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1970
(24)	80	Chrome ore - <u>Klostertor</u> : United Kingdom note dated 10 June 1970
(25)	89	Chrome ore - <u>Ville du Havre</u> : United Kingdom note dated 18 August 1970
(26)	95	Ferro-chrome and ferrosilicon chrome - <u>Trautenfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 11 September 1970
(27)	100	Chrome - <u>Cuxhaven</u> : United Kingdom note dated 16 October 1970
(28)	103	Chrome ore - <u>Anna Presthus</u> : United Kingdom note dated 30 October 1970
(29)	108	Chrome ore - <u>Schonfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
(30)	110	Chrome ores - <u>Kybfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 January 1971
(31)	116	Chrome ores and concentrates - <u>Rotenfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 31 March 1971
(32)	130	Chrome ore - <u>Agios Georgios</u> : Information supplied by Somalia on 27 March 1972

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(33)	135	Chrome ore - <u>Santos Vega</u> : Information supplied by Somalia on 20 March 1972
(34)	153	Ferro-chrome - <u>Itaimbe</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 August 1973
(35)	165	Chrome ore - <u>Gemstone</u> : United Kingdom note dated 5 February 1974
(36)	212	Ferro-chrome - <u>Gerd Wesch</u> : United Kingdom note dated 9 July 1975
(37)	245	Ferro-chrome - Trade with Southern Rhodesia by a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany: United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1976
(38)	269	High-carbon ferro-chrome - <u>Jupiter Su</u> : United Kingdom note dated 9 June 1976
(39)	270	High-carbon ferro-chrome - <u>Frontier</u> : United Kingdom note dated 9 June 1976
<u>Silicon</u>		
(40)	178	Silicon-chrome - <u>Tsedek</u> : United Kingdom note dated 7 June 1974
(41)	179	Silicon metal - <u>Atlantic Fury</u> : United Kingdom note dated 18 June 1974
<u>Ferro-manganese</u>		
(42)	185	Ferro-manganese - <u>Straat Nagasaki</u> : United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1974
<u>Tungsten ore</u>		
(43)	78	Tungsten ore - <u>Tenko Maru</u> and <u>Suruga Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 28 May 1970
<u>Copper</u>		
(44)	12	Copper concentrates - <u>Tjipondok</u> : United Kingdom note dated 12 May 1969
(45)	15	Copper concentrates - <u>Eizan Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 4 June 1969
(46)	34	Copper exports: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(47)	51	Copper concentrates - <u>Straat Futami</u> : United Kingdom note dated 8 October 1969
(48)	99	Copper -- various ships: United Kingdom note dated 9 October 1970
<u>Nickel</u>		
(49)	102	Nickel - <u>Randfontein</u> : United Kingdom note dated 28 October 1970
(50)	109	Nickel - <u>Sloterkerk</u> : United Kingdom note dated 11 January 1971
(51)	118	Nickel - <u>Serooskerk</u> : United Kingdom note dated 6 May 1971
(52)	193	Electrolytic nickel cathodes - <u>Pleias</u> : United Kingdom note dated 22 October 1974
<u>Aluminium</u>		
(53)	250	Aluminium export by a Belgian company: United Kingdom note dated 22 March 1976
<u>Lithium ores</u>		
(54)	20	Petalite - <u>Sado Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 30 June 1969
(55)	24	Petalite - <u>Abbekerk</u> : United Kingdom note dated 12 July 1969
(56)	30	Petalite - <u>Simonskerk</u> : United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969
(57)	32	Petalite - <u>Yang Tse</u> : United Kingdom note dated 6 August 1969
(58)	46	Petalite - <u>Kyotai Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969
(59)	54	Lepidolite - <u>Ango</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 October 1969
(60)	86	Petalite ore - <u>Krugerland</u> : United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1970
(61)	107	Tantalite - <u>Table Bay</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
(62)	151	Petalite - <u>Merrimac</u> : United Kingdom note dated 30 July 1973

Serial No. Case No.

Pig-iron and steel billets

- (63) 29 Pig-iron - Mare Piceno:
United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1969
- (64) 70 Steel billets:
United Kingdom note dated 16 February 1970
- (65) 85 Steel billets - Despinan and Birooni:
United Kingdom note dated 30 July 1970
- (66) 114 Steel products - Gemini Exporter:
United Kingdom note dated 3 February 1971
- (67) 137 Steel billets - Malaysia Fortune
United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972
- (68) 138 Steel billets - Aliakmon Pilot:
United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972
- (69) 140 Steel billets and maize - Char Hwa:
United Kingdom note dated 9 April 1973
- (70) 236 Steel billets - Trianon:
United Kingdom note dated 23 December 1975
- (71) 239 Steel billets - Shinkai Maru:
United Kingdom note dated 14 January 1976
- (72) 246 Steel billets - Antje Schulte:
United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1976
- (73) 265 Steel billets - Alesandros Skoutaris:
United Kingdom note dated 19 May 1976
- (74) 266 Steel billets - Aristedes Xilas:
United Kingdom note dated 17 May 1976

Graphite

- (75) 38 Graphite - Kaapland:
United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
- (76) 43 Graphite - Tanga:
United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
- (77) 62 Graphite - Transvaal, Kaapland, Stellenbosch
and Swellendam:
United Kingdom note dated 22 December 1969

B. MINERAL FUELS

Serial No. Case No.

(78) 172 Crude oil:
United Kingdom note dated 7 May 1974

C. TOBACCO

(79) 4 Tobacco - Mokaria:
United Kingdom note dated 24 January 1969

(80) 10 Tobacco - Mohasi:
United Kingdom note dated 29 March 1969

(81) 19 Tobacco - Goodwill:
United Kingdom note dated 25 June 1969

(82) 26 Transactions in Southern Rhodesian tobacco:
United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969

(83) 35 Tobacco - Montaigle:
United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969

(84) 82 Tobacco - Elias L:
United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1970

(85) 92 Cigarettes believed to be manufactured in
Rhodesia:
United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970

(86) 98 Tobacco - Hellenic Beach:
United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1970

(87) 104 Tobacco - Agios Nicolaos:
United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970

(88) 105 Tobacco - Montalto:
United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970

(89) 149 Tobacco - Straat Holland:
United Kingdom note dated 19 July 1973

(90) 156 Tobacco - Hellenic Glory:
United Kingdom note dated 4 October 1973

(91) 157 Tobacco - Oranjeland:
United Kingdom note dated 9 October 1973

(92) 196 Tobacco - Streefkerk and Swellendam:
United Kingdom note dated 5 December 1974

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(93)	202	Tobacco - <u>Drammensford</u> : United Kingdom note dated 6 March 1975
(94)	207	Tobacco: United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1975
(95)	262	Tobacco - <u>Pereira d'Eca</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1976
(96)	281	Trade in tobacco from Southern Rhodesia via Switzerland: United Kingdom note dated 1 September 1976

D. CEREALS

(97)	18	Trade in maize: United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1969
(98)	39	Maize - <u>Fraternity</u> : United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(99)	44	Maize - <u>Galini</u> : United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
(100)	47	Maize - <u>Santa Alexandra</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969
(101)	49	Maize - <u>Zeno</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 September 1969
(102)	56	Maize - <u>Julia L.</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 November 1969
(103)	63	Maize - <u>Polyxene C.</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969
(104)	90	Maize - <u>Virgy</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970
(105)	91	Maize - <u>Master Daskalos</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970
(106)	97	Maize - <u>Lambros M. Fatsis</u> : United Kingdom note dated 30 September 1970
(107)	106	Maize - <u>Corviglia</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
(108)	124	Maize - <u>Armonia</u> : United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(109)	125	Maize - <u>Alexandros S:</u> United Kingdom note dated 23 September 1971
(110)	139	Maize - <u>Pythia:</u> United Kingdom note dated 6 April 1973
E. COTTON AND COTTON SEEDS		
(111)	53	Cotton seed - <u>Holly Trader:</u> United Kingdom note dated 23 October 1969
(112)	96	Cotton - <u>S.A. Statesman:</u> United Kingdom note dated 14 September 1970
F. MEAT		
(113)	8	Meat - <u>Kaapland:</u> United Kingdom note dated 10 March 1969
(114)	13	Meat - <u>Zuiderkerk:</u> United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1969
(115)	14	Beef - <u>Tabora:</u> United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1969
(116)	16	Beef - <u>Tugelaland:</u> United Kingdom note dated 16 June 1969
(117)	22	Beef - <u>Swellendam:</u> United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1969
(118)	33	Meat - <u>Taveta:</u> United Kingdom note dated 8 August 1969
(119)	42	Meat - <u>Polana:</u> United Kingdom note dated 17 September 1969
(120)	61	Chilled meat: United Kingdom note dated 8 December 1969
(121)	68	Pork - <u>Alcor:</u> United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970
(122)	117	Frozen meat - <u>Drymakos:</u> United Kingdom note dated 21 April 1971
(123)	183	Trade in meat and banking facilities: United Kingdom note dated 25 June 1974

G. SUGAR

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(124)	28	Sugar - <u>Byzantine Monarch</u> : United Kingdom note dated 21 July 1969
(125)	60	Sugar - <u>Filotis</u> : United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969
(126)	65	Sugar - <u>Eleni</u> : United Kingdom note dated 5 January 1970
(127)	72	Sugar - <u>Lavrentios</u> : United Kingdom note dated 8 April 1970
(128)	83	Sugar - <u>Angelia</u> : United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1970
(129)	94	Sugar - <u>Philomila</u> : United Kingdom note dated 28 August 1970
(130)	112	Sugar - <u>Evangelos M</u> : United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1971
(131)	115	Sugar - <u>Aegean Mariner</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 March 1971
(132)	119	Sugar - <u>Calli</u> : United Kingdom note dated 10 May 1971
(133)	122	Sugar - <u>Netanya</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1971
(134)	126	Sugar - <u>Netanya</u> : United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1971
(135)	128	Sugar - <u>Netanya</u> : United Kingdom note dated 11 February 1972
(136)	132	Sugar - <u>Primrose</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1972
(137)	147	Sugar - <u>Anangel Ambition</u> : United Kingdom note dated 27 June 1973

H. FERTILIZERS AND AMMONIA

(138)	2	Import of manufactured fertilizers from Europe: United Kingdom note dated 14 January 1969
(139)	48	Ammonia - <u>Butaneuve</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(140)	52	Bulk ammonia: United Kingdom notes dated 15 October and 10 November 1969
(141)	66	Ammonia -- <u>Cérons</u> : United Kingdom note dated 7 January 1970
(142)	69	Ammonia -- <u>Mariotte</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970
(143)	101	Anhydrous ammonia: United States note dated 12 October 1970
(144)	113	Anhydrous ammonia -- <u>Cypress</u> and <u>Isfonn</u> : United Kingdom note dated 29 January 1971
(145)	123	Anhydrous ammonia -- <u>Zion</u> : United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971
(146)	129	Anhydrous ammonia -- <u>Kristian Birkeland</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 February 1972
(147)	204	Import of agricultural crop chemicals into Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 13 March 1975

I. MACHINERY

(148)	50	Tractor kits: United Kingdom note dated 2 October 1969
(149)	58	Book-keeping and accounting machines: Italian note dated 6 November 1969
(150)	170	Spare parts for sewing or knitting machines: <u>"Elbeland"</u> United Kingdom note dated 10 April 1974
(151)	189	Wankie power station: United Kingdom note dated 9 September 1974
(152)	209	Rolling mill rolls: United Kingdom note dated 6 June 1975
(153)	221	Supply of electrical equipment: United Kingdom note dated 1 September 1975
(154)	238	Replacement equipment for steel processing plants in Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 6 January 1976

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(155)	256	Supply of machine parts to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 April 1976
(156)	267	Industrial sewing machines from Japan - <u>Straat Hong Kong</u> : United Kingdom note dated 17 May 1976

J. TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT

Motor vehicles and/or motor-vehicle spares

(157)	9	Motor vehicles: United States note dated 28 March 1969
(158)	145	Trucks, engines etc.: Information obtained by the Committee from published sources
(159)	168	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - <u>Straat Rio</u> : United Kingdom note dated 15 March 1974
(160)	173	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - <u>Daphne</u> : United Kingdom note dated 16 May 1974
(161)	180	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - <u>Straat Rio</u> : United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1974
(162)	182	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - <u>M. Citadel</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1974
(163)	195	Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - <u>Soula K</u> : United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1974
(164)	197	Trade in motor vehicles (and other commodities): United Kingdom note dated 6 December 1974:

Aircraft and/or aircraft spares

(165)	41	Aircraft spares: United Kingdom note dated 5 September 1969
(166)	67	Supply of aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 January 1970
(167)	144	Sale of three Boeing aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(168)	162	Viscount aircraft: United Kingdom note dated 17 January 1974

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(169)	206	Jet fighters and other military equipment: Information obtained from published sources
(170)	232	Acquisition of DC-8 aircraft by Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1975
<u>Others</u>		
(171)	88	Cycle accessories: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1970
(172)	141	Locomotives - <u>Beira</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1973

K. TEXTILE FABRICS AND RELATED PRODUCTS

(173)	93	Shirts manufactured in Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970
-------	----	---

L. SPORTING ACTIVITIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIONS

(174)	120	Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games: Note from the Federal Republic of Germany dated 5 April 1971
(175)	148	Southern Rhodesia and the Maccabiah Games: Information supplied to the Committee by the Sudan on 21 June 1973
(176)	166	Southern Rhodesia and the International Judo Federation: Information obtained from published sources
(177)	167	Tour of Southern Rhodesian cricket player abroad: Information obtained from published sources
(178)	174	Hockey team on tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(179)	175	Yachting coach on tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(180)	181	Southern Rhodesia and the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA): Information obtained from published sources
(181)	186	Southern Rhodesia and the International Chess Federation (FIDE): Information obtained from published sources
(182)	191	Cricket club tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(183)	192	Hockey club on tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(184)	198	Southern Rhodesia and the golf championships in Colombia: Information obtained from published sources
(185)	199	Golf championships in the Dominican Republic: Information obtained from published sources
(186)	205	Irish Rugby team tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(187)	211	Tour of certain European countries by Southern Rhodesian hockey club: Information obtained from published sources
(188)	215	Southern Rhodesia and the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGS): Information obtained from published sources
(189)	216	United States basketball coach tour of Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(190)	217	Visit to Southern Rhodesia by Argentinian hockey umpire: Information obtained from published sources
(191)	219	Southern Rhodesia and the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF): Information obtained from published sources
(192)	220	Southern Rhodesia and the International Amateur Swimming Federation (FINA): Information obtained from published sources
(193)	222	Participation of Southern Rhodesian yachtsmen in the World Fireball Regatta in France: Information obtained from published sources
(194)	223	International squash tournament in Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(195)	224	Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the World Ploughing Match in Canada: Information obtained from published sources
(196)	225	Visit of English polo team to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(197)	226	International Wanderers cricket team visit to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(198)	228	Visit of Southern Rhodesia karate coach to France: Information obtained from published sources
(199)	229	Participation of Southern Rhodesian player in the international tennis championships in Spain: Information obtained from published sources
(200)	230	Participation of Southern Rhodesian in the commemorative Marathon in Greece: Information obtained from published sources
(201)	231	Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the Dewar Tennis Cup matches: Information obtained from published sources
(202)	234	Visit of the American All-Stars College Basketball Team to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(203)	235	Participation of foreign jockeys in Salisbury's Plate Glass Jockey's International: Information obtained from published sources
(204)	237	Participation of foreign sportsmen in Rhodesian Open Tennis Championships: Information obtained from published sources
(205)	240	Participation of a Southern Rhodesian in the World Championship Tennis tournament in the United States of America: Information obtained from published sources
(206)	241	Participation of a United States citizen in the Rhodesian Open Chess Championships: Information obtained from published sources
(207)	242	Southern Rhodesia and the International Sports Federations (ISF) Games: Information obtained from published sources
(208)	244	Participation of Malawi in swimming association with Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(209)	248	Cypriot soccer players in Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(210)	249	Participation of a Southern Rhodesian yachtsman in Rio race (Brazil): Information obtained from published sources
(211)	251	Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the British Women's Open Squash Championships: Information obtained from published sources
(212)	252	English cricket team visit to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(213)	253	Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the World Amateur Team Golf Championships in Portugal: Information obtained from published sources
(214)	254	Visit of the Gloucestershire Rugby team to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(215)	255	Participation of a baseball team from the United States in the test series against Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(216)	257	English boys' hockey team tour to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(217)	258	Participation of Southern Rhodesian in the Valencia (Spain) international tennis tournament: Information obtained from published sources
(218)	260	Southern Rhodesian women's team and the Philadelphia Federation Cup international tennis tournament: Information obtained from published sources
(219)	264	Southern Rhodesia and the world championships of bodybuilders in Canada: Information obtained from published sources
(220)	268	Junior golf team from the United States tour of Southern Rhodesia in 1977: Information obtained from published sources
(221)	271	Participation of two Southern Rhodesian soccer players in the 1977 Greek soccer season: Information obtained from published sources
(222)	277	Visit of a Uruguayan polo team to Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(223)	278	Participation of Southern Rhodesia in the 1977 Davis Cup tennis tournament: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(224)	279	Participation of an Australian team in the international squash tournament in Southern Rhodesia; Information obtained from published sources
(225)	280	Participation of a Southern Rhodesian team in the world combat pistol championships in Salzburg, Austria; Information obtained from published sources
M. BANKING, INSURANCE AND OTHER RELATED FACILITIES		
(226)	163	Swiss company loan to Rhodesia Railways; United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1974
(227)	171	Rhodesia Iron and Steel Corporation (RISCO): Information obtained from published sources
(228)	176	New Zealand insurance companies: Information obtained from published sources
(229)	203	Payment by Southern Rhodesian bank to Austrian company: United Kingdom note dated 7 March 1975
(230)	208	Financial loan to a Southern Rhodesian company: United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1975
N. TOURISM AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS		
(231)	143	Southern Rhodesian representational offices abroad: (a) Rhodesia National Tourist Board, Basel, Switzerland; (b) Rhodesian information centre and Air Rhodesia office, Sydney, Australia; (c) Rhodesia information office, Washington, DC, USA; (d) Rhodesia information office, Paris, France, Information obtained from published sources and from non-governmental sources
(232)	190	Tourism agencies and Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(233)	194	Holiday Inns and car-rental activities: Information obtained from published sources

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(234)	213	Flights to and from Southern Rhodesia: Case opened at the 243rd meeting
(235)	227	Organized tours abroad for persons using Southern Rhodesian passports: Information obtained from published sources
(236)	275	Visit to Southern Rhodesia by travel agents from the United States of America: Information obtained from published sources
O. OTHER CASES		
(237)	133	Supply of medical equipment to the University of Southern Rhodesia: Swedish note dated 7 June 1972
(238)	154	<u>Tango Romeo</u> - Sanctions-breaking activities via Gabon: Information obtained from published sources and supplied to the Committee by the United Kingdom on 30 August 1973
(239)	155	Cameras from Switzerland: United Kingdom note dated 27 September 1973
(240)	158	Pine oil from the United States - <u>Charlotte Lykes</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 October 1973
(241)	159	Cardboard containers from Spain: United Kingdom note dated 12 November 1973
(242)	201	Danish trade with Southern Rhodesia: Information supplied by Denmark
(243)	210	Supply of various items of miscellaneous equipment to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1975
(244)	214	Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia: Information supplied by Switzerland
(245)	218	Southern Rhodesia and the International Chamber of Commerce: Information obtained from published sources
(246)	233	Supply of chemical substances to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 1 December 1975
(247)	243	Federal Republic of Germany trade with Southern Rhodesia: Information supplied by the Federal Republic of Germany

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(248)	247	Chemical products - trade with Southern Rhodesia by a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany: United Kingdom note dated 23 February 1976
(249)	259	Violation of sanctions by a subsidiary firm in the United Kingdom: United Kingdom note dated 2 April 1976
(250)	261	Trade with Southern Rhodesia by an Italian firm: United Kingdom note dated 5 May 1976
(251)	263	Trade with Southern Rhodesia by a Belgian firm: United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1976
(252)	272	Shipment of milk powder to Southern Rhodesia - <u>Tugelaland</u> : Federal Republic of Germany note dated 10 March 1975
(253)	273	Recruitment of mercenaries for Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources
(254)	274	Purchase of timber from Southern Rhodesia by a United Kingdom public corporation: Information obtained from published sources and supplied to the Committee by the United Kingdom on 5 May 1976
(255)	276	Activities of Lonrho and other United Kingdom companies: Information obtained from published sources and from non-governmental sources

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

<u>Case No.</u>	
USI-1	<u>La Chacra</u> : United Kingdom
USI-2	<u>Treutenfels</u> : Federal Republic of Germany
USI-3	<u>Bris</u> : Norway
USI-4	<u>African Sun, Moormacove, Moormacargo, African Moon, African Lightning, Moormacbay, African Mercury, African Dawn and Moormactrade</u> : United States
USI-5	<u>Hellenic Leader, North Highness, Venthisikimi and Ocean Pegasus</u> : Greece

Case No.

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

USI-7 Angelo Scinicarello and Alfredo Primo: Italy

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

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

USI-10 Trade Carrier: Liberia

USI-11 Hellenic Destiny: Greece

USI-12 Costas Frangos: Greece

USI-13 Adelfoi: Liberia

USI-14 Costas Frangos and Nortrans Unity: Greece

USI-15 Weltevreden: South Africa

USI-16 Steinfels: Federal Republic of Germany

USI-17 Nedlloyd Kingston: Netherlands

USI-19 Nedlloyd Kembla: Netherlands

USI-20 Morganstar: South Africa

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

USI-22 Sun River: Norway

USI-24 Wildenfels and Steinfels: Federal Republic of Germany

USI-25 Hellenic Destiny: Greece

USI-26 Weser Express: Federal Republic of Germany

USI-27 Stockenfels: Federal Republic of Germany

USI-28 S.A. Huguenot: South Africa

USI-29 Hellenic Laurel: Greece

USI-30 Nedlloyd Kimberly: Netherlands

USI-31 Nedlloyd Kembla: Netherlands

USI-32 Hellenic Carrier: Greece

Case No.

USI-33 Nedlloyd Kyoto: Netherlands
USI-34 Diana Skou: Denmark
USI-35 Hellenic Sun: Greece
USI-36 New England Trapper: Liberia
USI-37 Ogden Sacramento: Panama
USI-38 Ascendant: Panama
USI-39 Safina-E-Rehmet: Pakistan
USI-40 Nedlloyd Kingston: Netherlands
USI-41 Ogden Missouri: Panama
USI-42 Platte: Panama
USI-43 Great Faith: Panama
USI-44 Kaderbaksh: Pakistan
USI-45 Ocean Envoy: Pakistan
USI-46 Phaedra E: Greece

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

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

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

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

INGO-5 Ferro-chrome:
Information obtained from non-governmental sources

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

Case No.

- INGO-7 Tourism and travel to and from Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the Research Group for Interparliamentary
Questions, Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany
- INGO-8 Tourism, immigration and transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the National Anti-Apartheid Committee
(NAAC) of New Zealand
- INGO-9 Cargo Air Transport (CAT):
Information supplied by the Comité contre le colonialisme et
l'apartheid, Brussels, Belgium
- INGO-10 Package tours to Southern Rhodesia and landing rights to
airlines flying to Salisbury:
Information supplied by Ms. Barbara Rogers
- INGO-11 Tour to Southern Rhodesia organized by a United Kingdom
travel agency:
Information supplied by the Women's International League for
Peace and Freedom (WILPF), British Section, London
- 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, France
- INGO-13 Mining operations in Southern Rhodesia by Canadian-owned
companies:
Information supplied by the Taskforce on the Churches and
Corporate Responsibility, Toronto, Canada
- INGO-14 Export of military aircraft to Southern Rhodesia by New Zealand:
Information received from the President of the Citizens'
Association for Racial Equality (CARE), New Zealand
- INGO-15 Irish hockey team tour in Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the Anti-apartheid Movement, Dublin,
Ireland
- INGO-16 Acquisition of military aircraft and spare parts from
New Zealand by Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the National Anti-apartheid Committee
of New Zealand
- INGO-17 Supply of oil and oil products to Southern Rhodesia:
Information supplied by the Anti-apartheid Movement, United
States of America, and the Center for Social Action of the
United Church of Christ, New York.

Annex I

MEETINGS OF THE CHAIRMAN WITH THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES OF COUNTRIES FROM WHICH REPLIES WERE STILL PENDING AFTER THIRD (OR SECOND) REMINDERS

Report by the Chairman

1. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, notes dated 13 August 1976 were sent by the Chairman to the Permanent Representatives of Brazil, Gabon, Jordan, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zambia, announcing the Chairman's intention of calling on them, at the request of the Committee, to discuss cases in connexion with which replies were still pending after three (or two) reminders.
2. It may be recalled that at its 268th meeting the Committee decided to send appropriate special reminders to those countries which had failed to reply to notes from the Committee in Case No. 154 ("Tango Romeo" - Sanctions-breaking activities via Gabon), namely, Gabon, Malawi, Portugal, South Africa, Zaire and Zambia, and requested the Chairman to make personal contact with the Permanent Representatives of the countries concerned so that he might impress upon them the gravity of the Committee's concern. The special reminders were transmitted to the countries concerned on 1 June 1976. Since all the countries concerned, with the exception of Zaire, were already on the list of countries to be visited by the Chairman pursuant to the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, Case No. 154 was included among the cases to be discussed with the Permanent Representative of the particular country concerned. In the case of Zaire, the Chairman intends to contact the Permanent Representative of that Government in connexion with Case No. 154 specifically.
3. It may further be recalled in connexion with Case No. 154 that, at the 269th meeting, the Committee requested the Chairman to seek clarification, during his personal meeting with the Permanent Representative of Gabon, of a report in the Gabonese press on 6 May 1976 that the company Affretair had been dissolved and was being incorporated in Air Gabon and that Affretair would be compensated. If the report was confirmed, the Chairman would express the Committee's concern about violations of sanctions that might result from the payment of compensation.
4. Subsequent to the dispatch of the Chairman's notes of 13 August 1976, a reply dated 3 August 1976 was received from Uruguay in connexion with Case No. 185, that is, the case which the Chairman intended to discuss with the Permanent Representative of that country. That reply was circulated to the Committee on 20 August 1976 [see (42) Case No. 185, para. 5, vol. II, annex II of the present report]. Accordingly, the Chairman did not call on the Permanent Representative of Uruguay.
5. As of the date of this note, the Chairman has contacted the Permanent Representatives of the countries listed below in English alphabetical order.

Brazil

Subject of discussion: Case No. 153: Ferro-chrome - Itaimbe

6. On 26 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Brazil and discussed the above-mentioned case.
7. The Permanent Representative emphatically stated Brazil's full support of resolutions against Southern Rhodesia. Necessary measures had been taken, he stated, to incorporate laws against relations with Southern Rhodesia into the general law of Brazil, and this year, these laws had been extended to include insurance matters.
8. With regard to Case No. 153, the Permanent Representative stated that a thorough search had failed to locate the documentation necessary to provide proof of origin, particularly in view of the problems created by the transfer of such records from Rio de Janeiro to Brasilia. This position was later confirmed in a note dated 27 August 1976 from Brazil, which was circulated to the Committee on 8 September 1976 [see (34) Case No. 153, para. 6, vol. II, annex II of the present report/].
9. Regarding Case No. 212, the Permanent Representative handed over a written reply, together with documentation, which has been placed on the records of the Committee [see (36) Case No. 212, para. 8, vol. II, annex II of the present report/].

Gabon

Subject of discussion: Case No. INGO-9: Cargo Air Transport
Case No. 232: Acquisition of DC-8 aircraft by Southern Rhodesia
Case No. 61: Chilled meat
Case No. 154: Tango Romeo - Sanctions-breaking activities via Gabon

10. On 19 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Gabon, and discussed the above-mentioned cases. The Chairman briefly described the background of the cases in question and reiterated the importance that the Committee attached to the co-operation of Governments.
11. The Permanent Representative indicated that he had personally spoken to the President of Gabon regarding this matter some time previously. The President decided that Affretair should be nationalized and amalgamated with Air Gabon. He informed the Chairman that there were no more flights between Gabon and Southern Rhodesia (to Salisbury) and the problem, in his opinion, stood resolved. When informed by the Chairman of the Committee's views on compensation to Affretair, the Permanent Representative was not in a position to offer any comments but promised to make a reference to his Government.
12. On the issue of meat imports from Rhodesia, he mentioned the absence of alternative sources of supply. He intimated that purchasing missions had been sent to locate new sources, e.g., Botswana and Mozambique. As soon as alternative arrangements were made, this, the only trade with Southern Rhodesia, would also be

terminated. The Permanent Representative also stated that his Government planned to explore the possibility of seeking compensation for loss of trade. Subsequently, a reply dated 25 September 1976 was received from Gabon and circulated to the Committee on 26 October 1976 (see (238) Case No. 154, para. 16 (i), vol. II of the present report/).

Jordan

Subject of discussion: Case No. 137: steel billets - Malaysia Fortune

13. On 21 September 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Jordan and discussed the above-mentioned case.

14. The Permanent Representative indicated that it was the policy of Jordan to comply with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council with regard to restrictions of trade with Southern Rhodesia. He expressed surprise that Jordan should import anything from Southern Rhodesia and indicated that falsified documents may have misled the Ministry of Import into allowing the import.

15. The Chairman reviewed the status of the case in question, and the Permanent Representative indicated that even though some time had passed and he was personally unfamiliar with the case, he would make every effort to solicit a substantive reply from his Government.

16. Subsequently, a reply dated 14 October 1976 was received from Jordan, the substantive part of which was circulated to the Committee on 18 October 1976 /see (67) Case No. 137, para. 6, vol. II, annex II of the present report/.

Liberia

Subject of discussion: Case No. 179: High-grade silicon metal - Atlantic Fury
Case No. USI-36: Electrolytic nickel cathodes - New England Trapper

17. On 30 August 1976, the Chairman spoke to the Permanent Representative of Liberia and discussed the above-mentioned cases.

18. The Permanent Representative promised to urge her Government to expedite the pending replies to the Committee.

Malawi

Subject of discussion: Case No. INGO-4: Air Rhodesia and IATA agreements
Case No. 213: Flights to and from Southern Rhodesia
Case No. 154: Tango Romeo - Sanctions-breaking activities via Gabon

19. On 16 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Malawi and discussed the above-cited cases. He stressed the great importance attached by the Committee to the co-operation of all States, in enforcing the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

20. The Permanent Representative recalled that Malawi had explained at the 1964 summit meeting of non-aligned countries at Cairo its peculiar difficulties in joining the boycott of Southern Rhodesia. As a landlocked country, with access to the sea through only Beira or Cape Town, Malawi had been compelled to refrain from enforcing sanctions. However, in 1975, after the independence of Mozambique, the President of Malawi had directed the business community of the country to find alternative markets for their products, so that a trade boycott of Southern Rhodesia could be instituted. In 1976, only a week before Mozambique's closure of its borders with Southern Rhodesia, the warning had been repeated by the President in anticipation of action.

21. Regarding air travel, especially flights by Air Rhodesia and Air Malawi, the Permanent Representative indicated that all flights between Blantyre and Salisbury had been halted. He further stated that there had been considerable tourist traffic from Southern Rhodesia to Malawi, which has also been halted. These two actions alone had resulted in a loss to Malawi of 25,000 to 30,000 kwachas.

22. By a letter of the same date, that is 16 September 1976, addressed to the Chairman, the Permanent Representative of Malawi recalled the essence of their meeting and confirmed that he had sent an appropriate message to his Government on 17 August 1976: as soon as a reply was received, he would communicate the same to the Chairman immediately. Subsequently, a reply dated 27 September 1976 was received from Malawi in connexion with Case No. 213 and Case No. INGO-4 and circulated to the Committee on 6 October 1976 /see (234) Case No. 213, para. F, vol. II, annex II of the present report/.

Panama

Subject of discussion: Case No. USI-37: Chrome ore - Ogden Sacramento
Case No. USI-38: High-carbon ferro-chrome - Ascendant

23. Also on 16 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Panama and discussed the above-mentioned cases.

24. The Permanent Representative indicated that pending replies would be forwarded to the secretariat of the Committee shortly.

25. As a result of the Chairman's meeting, a reply dated 17 August 1976, in connexion with Case Nos. USI-41, USI-42, and USI-43, and another reply dated 9 September 1976, in connexion with Case No. 195, were received from Panama and circulated to the Committee on 5 October 1976 /see Case No. USI-41, paras. 9 and 14, Case No. USI-42, para. 2 and Case No. USI-43, para. 2, vol. II, annex II of the present report. Also see (163) Case No. 195, para. 6, vol. II, annex II of the present report/. Replies regarding Case Nos. USI-37 and USI-38 remain outstanding.

Portugal

Subject of discussion: Case No. INGO-4: Air Rhodesia and IATA agreements
Case No. 213: Flights to and from Southern Rhodesia
Case No. 227: Organized tours abroad for persons
using Southern Rhodesian passports
Case No. 52: Bulk amonia
Case No. 154: Tango Romeo - Sanctions-breaking
activities via Gabon

26. On 21 September 1976, the Chairman met with the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of Portugal to the United Nations and discussed the above-mentioned cases.

27. The Chairman stated briefly the background of the cases in question and reiterated the importance that the Committee attached to the co-operation of Governments.

28. The Chargé d'affaires indicated that administrative difficulties during the past two years, when Portugal was undergoing numerous changes, had been responsible for the delay in sending a reply. He affirmed that his Government was determined to respect the resolutions of the Security Council and indicated that every effort would be made to provide an answer to the Committee's inquiries as soon as possible.

29. Subsequently, the Chairman discussed these cases also with the Foreign Minister of Portugal. Thereafter, a comprehensive communication dated 14 October 1976 was received from Portugal and circulated to the Committee on 26 October 1976 /see para. 79 (p), vol. I of the present report/.

Spain

Subject of discussion: Case No. 218: Southern Rhodesia and the International Chamber of Commerce

30. On 13 September 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Spain and discussed the above-mentioned case.

31. The Permanent Representative indicated that a reply regarding this case would be forwarded to the secretariat of the Committee shortly.

32. A reply dated 14 September 1976 was subsequently received and circulated to the Committee on 30 September 1976 /see (245) Case No. 218, para. 7, vol. II, annex II of the present report/.

Venezuela

Subject of discussion: Case No. 124: Maize - Armonia
Case No. 125: Maize - Alexandros S

33. On 17 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Venezuela and discussed the above-mentioned cases involving shipments of maize.

34. The Permanent Representative promised to urge his Government to send a substantive reply before the next meeting of the Committee. That reply was later received by the Chairman in a note dated 23 August 1976. Subsequently, a reply dated 12 October 1976 was received from Venezuela and circulated to the Committee on 26 October 1977 /see (108) Case No. 124, para. 6, vol. II, annex II of the present report/.

Additional developments

35. It should be noted that by a letter dated 17 August 1976 Zambia acknowledged the Chairman's note of 13 August 1976, and advised him that Case Nos. 168 and 156, i.e., cases which the Chairman intended to discuss with the Permanent Representative of that country, had again been referred to the relevant authorities in Zambia and that as soon as a reply was received, it would be communicated to the Committee.

36. In view of the Committee's desire to consider the question of countries from which replies were still pending after third (or second) reminders at an early date, the Chairman felt it necessary to report the results of the meetings he has so far had. Unfortunately, it has not been possible for the Chairman to meet representatives of the remaining countries concerned, owing to their absence from Headquarters. The Chairman will continue his efforts to meet them and will give a further report in due course.

Annex II

CASES CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS REPORTS AND NEW CASES

Specific cases concerning suspected violations

A. METALLIC ORES, METALS AND THEIR ALLOYS

Ferro-chrome and chrome ores

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth, tenth and eleventh quarterly lists which were issued as press releases on 6 April, 13 August and 15 December 1976.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (11) Case No. 36. Ferro-chrome - "Ioannis": United Kingdom note dated 26 August 1969

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

- (12) Case No. 37. Ferro-chrome - "Halleren": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

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

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

There is now new information concerning this case in addition to that contained in the fourth report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(26) Case No. 95. Ferro-chrome and ferro-silicon - "Trautenfels": United Kingdom note dated 11 September 1970

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

See annex III below.

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

See annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Brazil, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.
4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Brazil, announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case in connexion with which a reply was still pending after two reminders.
5. On 26 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Brazil and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meeting see the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.
6. By a letter dated 27 August 1976, the Permanent Representative of Brazil transmitted to the Chairman a copy of a note of the same date which he had sent to the Secretary-General, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Following instructions from my Government concerning a cargo of ferro-chrome suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, reported to have been shipped to Brazil aboard the vessel Itaimbe, I wish to inform

you that the Brazilian authorities have completed the investigation of the case No. 153 which was first brought to their attention in September 1973.

"Despite all their efforts to comply with the request made by the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the investigations that were conducted in Brazil have failed to ascertain the exact origin of the above-mentioned cargo. This is due to the fact that no documents could be produced as evidence that the ferro-chrome was of Southern Rhodesian origin. According to the recollection of some customs authorities the ferro-chrome was cleared in the regular way with no suspicion of fraud. In the course of the investigations, no document corroborating or disproving the suspected violation could be located in the official files. This has occasionally occurred, however, since the official archives were transferred to Brasilia, thus creating delays in the Government's normal routine.

"While regretting the inconvenience that such circumstances may have caused for the Committee, I would like to reaffirm Brazil's well-known policies of continuous support of all decisions taken by the Security Council concerning the adoption of sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. I earnestly hope that the explanations above meet the Committee's requests and that it may deem it proper to bring the case to an end. In the meantime, I remain at the Committee's disposal for any additional information it may wish to obtain on the matter."

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A third reminder was sent to Brazil on 23 February 1976.
4. A reply dated 10 March 1976 was received from Brazil, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"With regard to the above-mentioned note and to previous correspondence on case No. 212, inquiries by Brazilian authorities have determined that, in the period December 1974 to April 1975, two import licences which might have some bearing on the case were issued to Aço Villares SA. Both licences, however, recorded the imports as originating in Johannesburg, South Africa, and the shippers as the firm of Arnbold, Wilhelmi and Co. (Pty.), Ltd. The total value of the imports covered by those licences was \$US 61,320.

"The Brazilian Government is pursuing its investigation of this matter and further information will be forwarded to the Secretary-General of the United Nations as soon as it is obtained."

5. A note dated 8 April 1976 was sent to Brazil under the no-objection procedure, welcoming the Government's assurance that further investigations were being conducted by the appropriate authorities in order to determine the actual origin of the shipment in question. The note also expressed the Committee's hope that in doing so the authorities were taking into account the proper documentation accompanying commodities originating in southern Africa, as recommended in the Secretary-General's notes transmitted to all States on 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

6. First and second reminders were sent to Brazil on 9 June and 14 July 1976.

7. In the absence of a reply from Brazil within the prescribed period of two months, the Committee included that Government in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 August 1976.

8. A reply dated 24 August 1976 was received from Brazil enclosing documentation. The substantive part of the reply reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations ... has the honour to enclose, for transmittal to the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), a copy of the relevant documentation issued by Brazilian authorities in connexion with the import of a consignment of ferro-chrome originating from the Republic of South Africa and transported by the vessel Gerd Wesch."

9. The document, analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant, was a copy of the import declaration certificate issued by the Federal Tax Collectors Office, Finance Ministry, Brazil, declaring South Africa to be the origin of the cargo of low carbon ferro-chrome, weighing 40,800 kilogrammes gross (40,000 kg net) and valued at 478,867.12 cruzeiros (\$US 62,856.58) c.i.f., shipped from Lourenço Marques to Santos, Brazil, aboard the Gerd Wesch, a vessel given as being of the Federal Republic of Germany nationality. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that the document in question could not be considered as sufficient proof of origin of the suspect shipment. Accordingly, a further note dated 22 September 1976 was sent to Brazil, requesting copies of any other relevant documents that might have been submitted to the investigating authorities.

10. An acknowledgement dated 27 September 1976 was received from Brazil.

11. A first reminder was sent to Brazil on 24 November 1976.

(37) Case No. 245. Ferro-chrome - Trade with Southern Rhodesia by a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany, United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1976

1. By a note dated 13 February 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning the importation of ferro-chrome suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin by a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information, of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation, that a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany has been trading with Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that the firm of Siegfried Jacob of Ennepetal-Voerde in the Federal Republic of Germany have purchased approximately 3,200 tons of Rhodesian ferro-chrome valued at DM 4,200,000 from Rhodesian Alloys (Pvt), Ltd., of Gwelo in Southern Rhodesia. The ferro-chrome is being paid for in instalments over the period September 1975 to February 1976 through Union Acceptances, Ltd., of 66 Marshall Street, Johannesburg.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in order to assist them with their investigation into the possibility that the firm of Siegfried Jacob has been trading with Rhodesia.

"Should the company claim that the ferro-chrome is not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may wish to draw attention to his notes PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin, and to request the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the ferro-chrome is of non-Rhodesian origin."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 26 February 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. A first reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 27 April 1976.
4. A reply dated 10 May 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"A foreign trade audit carried out in March 1976 at the firm of Siegfried Jacob Metallwerke, Ennepetal-Voerde, did not turn up any evidence of Southern Rhodesian origin of the 3,280 tons of ferro-chrome imported by that company. The goods were purchased from Impex Alloys, Ltd., of Siblingen/Switzerland to which they had been sold by Nyala Agencies, Ltd., of Umhlanga Rocks/South Africa. The latter had applied for the certificates of origin which were issued by the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce and gave South Africa as country of origin. Consequently, the shipment cleared customs as South African ferro-chrome."

5. A note dated 23 June 1976 was sent to Switzerland under the no-objection procedure, transmitting the information received from the Federal Republic of Germany and requesting a thorough investigation by the Swiss authorities with a view to ascertain the exact origin of the ferro-chrome in question. The authorities were reminded of the inadequacy of certificates of origin issued by chambers of commerce in South Africa, and were requested to rely instead on the proper documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1976, copies of which were enclosed with the note.

6. An acknowledgement dated 25 June 1976 was received from Switzerland, indicating that the note had been transmitted to the Swiss authorities for the necessary investigations.

7. A note dated 27 August 1976 was sent to Switzerland, inquiring if the investigations were completed and the results could be forwarded to the Committee.

8. A reply dated 19 November 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantial part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to his notes of 23 June and 27 August 1976 concerning the sale by Impex Alloys, Ltd., of Siblingen, Switzerland, of 3,200 tons of ferro-chrome, presumed to be of Rhodesian origin, to the Siegfried Jacob Company of Ennepetal-Voerde, Federal Republic of Germany.

"As the Observer noted in detail in the replies given to the Secretary-General in cases Nos. 2 and 103 (Nitrex SA and Rif Trading Company Ltd.), Swiss authorities have no jurisdiction over transactions of this kind, so long as the merchandise in question does not enter Swiss territory. Nevertheless, they invited Impex Alloys, Ltd., to state their views on the acts alleged in the note by the Sanctions Committee.

"In its reply, the company pointed out that the ferro-chrome delivered to the Siegfried Jacob Company was of South African origin, a fact which was attested by a certificate from the Chamber of Commerce of Johannesburg. It appears that the question of the origin of this delivery had been scrupulously examined by an Official Commission of the Federal Republic of Germany, which had reached the conclusion that the origin was indeed that which had been attested by the Chamber of Commerce of Johannesburg."

(38) Case No. 269. High-carbon ferro-chrome - "Jupiter Sun": United Kingdom note dated 9 June 1976

1. By a note dated 9 June 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of ferro-chrome on the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

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

The information is to the effect that the SS Jupiter Sun, at Durban in mid-September 1975, loaded a consignment of about 50 tons of high-carbon ferro-chrome supplied by Universal Exports of Salisbury in Southern Rhodesia. The vessel, which is owned by Jupiter Lines (Pty), Ltd., of Durban and registered in South Africa, left Durban on 22 September and subsequently, between 16 and 20 October, put in at Buenos Aires where the material was unloaded for delivery to Acindar SA of Buenos Aires.

The sale was arranged through the Pittsburg and Cardiff Coal Company SA, Ltd., of Buenos Aires.

The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Argentina in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Argentinian firms may be trading with Southern Rhodesia and that ferro-chrome unloaded from the SS Jupiter Sun at Buenos Aires may be of Southern Rhodesian origin. Should the importer or purchaser claim that the ferro-chrome is not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to his notes of 18 December 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin, and to request the Government of Argentina to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the ferro-chrome was of non-Rhodesian origin.

2. In accordance with the Committee's standard practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 18 June 1976 was sent to Argentina, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. A reply dated 30 July 1976 [also covering Case No. 270] was received from Argentina, enclosing documentary evidence. The substantive part of the reply reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note _____ of 18 June 1976, concerning consignments of ferro-chrome shipped from southern African ports to Buenos Aires for Argentine firms.

"In this connexion I am able to state the following:

"(a) Immediately upon receiving the above communications the Government of the Argentine Republic started making the necessary inquiries in the proper public and private quarters.

"(b) The result of this action is reflected in the papers attached to this letter, from which it will be seen that due care was taken to determine the origin of the imported mineral as accurately as possible.

"(c) Having exhausted these efforts the Argentine Government considers that there are no grounds for supposing that any incident has occurred that could reasonably come within the competence of the Committee.

"(d) In conclusion the Argentine Government wishes to reaffirm its resolute support for the provisions of the United Nations regarding the question of Southern Rhodesia. Accordingly initiatives by the Committee, of the kind motivating this note, call for the utmost attention and priority action by the Argentine authorities, which consider them to be a reliable and effective method for the implementation of the international rules on this subject."

4. The attachments submitted by Argentina consisted of copies of the following documents:

(a) A purchase order issued by the consignee, Acindar Industria Argentina de Aceros, SA;

(b) Two invoices issued by the consignor, Arnold Wilhelmi and Co., Johannesburg, South Africa;

(c) A bill of lading transmitted by the Argentinian Government, and

(d) A certificate of origin issued by the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce

The documents, analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant, declared South Africa to be the origin of the cargo of ferro-chrome, weighing 54,000 kilograms gross (53,000 kg net) and valued at \$US 48,121.50, f.o.b., shipped from Durban to Buenos Aires, Argentina, aboard the SS Jupiter Sun, a vessel given as being of South African ownership and registration. It was pointed out to the Committee that the documents submitted by Argentina could not be considered as sufficient proof of the suspect shipment. However, in view of the South African ownership and registration of the vessel concerned, a note dated 24 September 1976 was sent to South Africa under the no-objection procedure, transmitting the original information contained in the United Kingdom note and requesting an investigation of the matter by the appropriate authorities, with a view to ascertain the exact origin of the shipment in question.

5. A first reminder was sent to South Africa on 24 November 1976.

(39) Case No. 270. High-carbon ferro-chrome - "MV Frontier": United Kingdom note dated 9 June 1976

1. By a note dated 9 June 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of ferro-chrome on the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

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

"The information is to the effect that in the latter part of December 1975 the MV Frontier was at the port of Maputo where she loaded a consignment of 90 tons of high carbon ferro-chrome supplied by Rhodesian Alloys, Ltd., of Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia. The ship left Maputo on 23 December and later put in at Port Elizabeth in the Republic of South Africa, where she loaded a further consignment of 75 tons of high carbon ferro-chrome supplied by Univex (Pvt) Ltd. of Stanley Avenue, again in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia. The vessel which is owned by the New Frontier Shipping Company, Ltd., of Panama, an associate of Grindrod, Gersigny and Company (Pty) of Durban, South Africa, left Port Elizabeth on 30 December and on 17 January put in at Buenos Aires in Argentina, where the ferro-chrome was unloaded for delivery to Acindar SA and to Establecimientos Metalurgicos Santa Rosa SA, both of Buenos Aires.

The sales were arranged by the Pittsburg and Cardiff Coal Company, SA, Ltd., of Buenos Aires.

The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Argentina in order to assist them with their enquiries into the possibility that any ferro-chrome unloaded from the MV Frontier at Buenos Aires was of Southern Rhodesian origin, and that Acindar SA, Establecimientos Metalurgicos Santa Rosa SA and the Pittsburg and Cardiff Coal Company SA may all be engaged in the importation of ferro-chrome from Southern Rhodesia. Should the importer, shipping company or shipping agent claim that the ferro-chrome was not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may wish to draw attention to his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin and to request the Government of Argentina to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the ferro-chrome is of non-Rhodesian origin."

2. In accordance with the Committee's standard practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 18 June 1976 was sent to Argentina, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 30 July 1976 was received from Argentina, enclosing documentary evidence. For the substantive part of that reply see paragraph 3 in (38) Case No. 269, above.

4. The attachments submitted by Argentina consisted of copies of the following documents:

(a) A letter of credit from the Bank of America, NT, SA, Buenos Aires, to Standard Bank of South Africa, Ltd., Johannesburg;

(b) A purchase order issued by one of the consignees, Acindar Industria Argentina de Aceros, SA;

(c) Three invoices issued by the consignor, Arnold Wilhelmi and Co., Johannesburg, South Africa;

(d) Three bills of lading transmitted by Argentina, and

(e) Three certificates of origin issued by the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce. The documents, analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant, indicated that the letter of credit in the value of \$US 30,000 was issued in respect of 34,000 kilograms of merchandise to be shipped from South Africa. The purchase order was made for 90 tons of ferro-chrome valued at \$US 56,727, but did not specify any country of origin for the shipment, like the bills of lading. The three invoices and certificates of origin showed South Africa to be the origin of three batches of the shipment: 91,884 kilograms gross (90,024 kg net) valued at \$US 59,751.49 f.o.b., shipped from Maputo, Mozambique, 34,680 kilograms, gross (34,000 kg net) valued at \$US 22,357.72, f.o.b. and 40,800 kilograms gross (40,000 kg net) valued at \$US 26,303.20, f.o.b., both shipped from Port Elizabeth, South Africa, and all delivered to Buenos Aires, Argentina, aboard the MV Frontier, a vessel given as being of Panamanian ownership. It was pointed out to the

Committee that the documents submitted by Argentina could not be considered as sufficient proof of origin of the suspect shipment. However, in view of the Panamanian ownership of the vessel concerned, a note dated 12 October 1976 was sent to Panama under the no-objection procedure, transmitting the original information contained in the United Kingdom note and requesting an investigation of the matter by the appropriate authorities, with a view to ascertain the exact origin of the shipment in question.

5. A reply dated 25 October 1976 was received from Panama, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Panama to the United Nations .. is pleased to inform the Secretary-General that it has received his note of 12 October 1976 concerning possible violations of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia under Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"The Permanent Mission of Panama further wishes to inform the Secretary-General that it has forwarded his complaint to the competent Panamanian authorities and will inform him of the results of these steps as soon as possible. There is no question that the Panamanian Government will act in a responsible manner and impose the sanctions prescribed by law if it is found that the reported violation did in fact take place."

6. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama case see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III, below.

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

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

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

3. A reply dated 4 March 1976 has been received from Israel, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations ... has not been authorized to state that in spite of further efforts made in Jerusalem, further information has become available to the Israeli authorities on the aforesaid subject, in addition to that already supplied to the Secretary-General from which the competent authorities of Israel concluded that the shipment referred to in the above-mentioned note is of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations avails himself of this opportunity to inform the Secretary-General that the Government of Israel has taken note of all the relevant Security Council resolutions concerning sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and act in accordance therewith."

4. The matter was considered at the 267th meeting on 28 April 1976, at which the Committee decided that an appropriate note should be prepared for transmission to Liberia, under the no-objection procedure; meanwhile, the United Kingdom Government

would seek further information from the Hong Kong authorities. In accordance with the Committee's decision, a note dated 25 May 1976 was sent to Liberia, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"For some time now the Committee has been considering the above-mentioned case concerning the shipment of a cargo of silicon chrome to Japan aboard the Israeli-owned vessel, the MV Tsedek, during the early part of 1974. The shipment was suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin. Subsequently, the Committee learned that during the voyage in question the vessel was on charter to a shipping company in Hong Kong, the Gold Star Line, and that, meanwhile, the name of the vessel had been changed to MV Gold Mountain. In order to ascertain the exact origin of the shipment in question the Committee has been trying to obtain from the appropriate parties concerned copies of the relevant documentation in respect of that shipment.

"Recently the Committee received information to the effect that the MV Gold Mountain, one day prior to its arrival in the port of Yokohama, Japan, on 5 April 1974, was sold by its owners, Zim-Israel Navigation Company, to a Liberian company known as Cedar Shipping Corporation. The Committee expressed the hope that the Liberian company might be in possession of either the shipping documents accompanying the cargo of silicon chrome or a copy of the charter agreement between Zim-Israel Navigation Company and the Gold Star Line of Hong Kong. The Committee, therefore, decided to request His Excellency's Government to assist it in the performance of its task by obtaining copies of the relevant documents indicated above, if available, and submitting them at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

5. At the 271st meeting on 3 June 1976 the representatives of the United Kingdom and Japan made statements concerning the case as follows:

(a) The representative of the United Kingdom said that at the 267th meeting of the Committee, his delegation had undertaken to ask the Hong Kong authorities to make further inquiries as to the seat of the Gold Star Line main office. According to the Sun Hing Shipping Company, which was the Hong Kong agent of the Gold Star Line, the Far East regional office of the Gold Star Line was located at Hua Tong Union Building, 5th floor, 76-1 Kyomachi, Ikuta-ku, Kobe, Japan. The Sun Hing Shipping Company did not know the address of the Gold Star Line's main office, but believed it was in Switzerland.

(b) The representative of Japan said that any further information that might be acquired by his Government in connexion with the Far East regional office of the Gold Star Line would be submitted to the Committee.

6. A first reminder was sent to Liberia on 30 July 1976.

7. A note dated 21 October 1976 was received from Liberia, advising that the competent government agency was seeking the required information from the Cedar Shipping Corporation, which would be transmitted to the Committee as soon as it was available.

8. A second reminder was sent to Liberia on 23 November 1976.

9. In the absence of a reply from Liberia within the prescribed period of two months the Committee included that Government in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 16 April and 13 August 1976.

4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Liberia announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.

5. On 30 August 1976 the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Liberia and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meeting see Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.

6. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

Ferro-manganese

(42) Case No. 185. Ferro-manganese - "Straat Nagasaki"

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

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

3. Second and third reminders were sent to Uruguay on 2 February and 10 March 1976, respectively.

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting that the Chairman should visit the Permanent Representatives of the countries in default of replies after three reminders, and that the latter should be notified of the Chairman's intention of visiting them through an informal note from the Chairman, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent to the Permanent Representative of Uruguay from the Chairman of the Committee.

5. Meanwhile a reply dated 3 August 1976 was received from Uruguay, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note of 24 September 1975.

"In that connexion I am able to inform you, in confirmation of my note NU184/975/J.3 of 27 February 1975, that the Government of Uruguay did not authorize any imports of ferro-manganese from Africa in 1974, apart from a small shipment from South Africa which was carried on board the Dutch-owned vessel Straat Nagoya and concerning which an account was given in the above-mentioned note.

"The shipping agency Dodero SA, representing the Straat Nagoya and Straat Nagasaki, has information available on cargoes shipped to Montevideo but not on cargoes going to Rio de Janeiro or other destinations. The Bank of the Republic, as was already stated, has not dealt with any imports by truck or other land conveyance of this mineral from Southern Rhodesia which could have been unloaded in Brazil.

"The authorities responsible for import procedures act in accordance with our country's traditional policy of strict compliance with the Security Council's resolutions on the Question of Rhodesia, and any irregularity that might be noticed - as was not the case in this instance - would be promptly and fully investigated with a view to ascertaining the facts and preventing any possible repetition."

6. In view of the above-cited reply from Uruguay which was received by the Committee subsequent to the dispatch of the Chairman's note of 13 August 1976, the Chairman felt that it was no longer necessary for him to contact the Permanent Representative of Uruguay.

Tungsten ore

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

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

Copper

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nickel

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

Aluminium

(53) Case No. 250. Export of aluminium products to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 22 March 1976

1. By a note dated 22 March 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning the export of aluminium products to Southern Rhodesia by a Belgian firm. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a Belgian firm has been trading with Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that since September 1975 the Société industrielle de l'Aluminium SA of Duffel in Belgium has supplied aluminium in the form of sheets, foil and tubing to Aluminium Industries, Ltd. ("Alcan"), corner Willowvale/Dagenham Roads, Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Belgium in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that the Société industrielle de l'Aluminium SA are supplying aluminium to Southern Rhodesia. The Secretary-General may further wish to suggest to the Government of Belgium that an examination of the files and accounts of the Société industrielle de l'Aluminium SA may prove helpful in view of the apparently regular nature of this trade."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 1 April 1976 has been sent to Belgium, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. First and second reminders were sent to Belgium within the prescribed period of two months, on 9 June and 14 July 1976, respectively.
4. In the absence of a reply from Belgium, the Committee included that Government in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 August 1976.
5. A third reminder was sent to Belgium on 19 August 1976.
6. A reply dated 6 October 1976 was received from Belgium, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note ... of 19 August 1976 regarding the United Kingdom's request that the Belgian authorities should carry out an investigation of a suspected violation of sanctions by Société industrielle de l'Aluminium, Duffel, through the supply of aluminium plate, sheet and tubes to Aluminium Industries, Ltd., Salisbury, Rhodesia.

"On the basis of the preliminary data provided by the United Kingdom, the Belgian authorities carried out an extensive investigation at the Sidal Company, with particular reference to all exports by that firm since September 1975.

"The Belgian authorities have instructed me to inform you that the investigation made by the competent departments revealed no irregularities with regard to the Belgian regulations on exports to Rhodesia."

Lithium ores

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Liberia and Panama, the Committee again included those Governments in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.
4. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.
5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A note dated 6 July 1976 was received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations ... requests that the following be brought to the attention of the Committee ...

"In its note of 2 April 1975, the Committee stated, inter alia, that the summary nature of the information it had received regarding Case No. 114 had not enabled the Committee 'to dispose of this case in a conclusive manner'.

"By its note of 3 November 1975, the Permanent Mission of Greece transmitted to the Committee, through the Secretary-General, an official translation of the minutes and judgement on Case No. 114.

"It should be noted, however, that, although the Committee had received this information, it included Case No. 114 in its eighth report as a 'case currently under consideration'.

"The Permanent Mission of Greece would be grateful therefore if it could be advised whether the Committee requires further information in order to close Case No. 114. If so, it is requested that the nature of the additional data required be specified."

4. In view of the question raised in the Greek note above, an explanatory note dated 16 August 1976 was sent to that Government, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has taken note of the procedural question raised in His Excellency's note of 6 July 1976 concerning the above-mentioned case. It wishes to put on record its appreciation for the co-operation it has often received from the Greek Government in several of the cases of possible violation of sanctions involving natural or juridical persons of Greek nationality. But it also recognizes the inevitable time lag that is sometimes experienced in reporting results of requested investigations, as His Excellency has indicated in a number of cases, by reason of the protracted proceedings of the independent judicial system.

"The reference to the present case, quoted in His Excellency's note of 6 July, for instance, was contained in the comprehensive note sent to the Government on 2 April 1975 concerning all the cases involving Greece. At the time of the note's preparation and dispatch the Committee had not yet received the promised official translation of the court's judgement; the Committee could not therefore dispose of the case conclusively then. When the Committee received the official translation by His Excellency's note dated 2 November 1975, it was pleased to announce that fact in its eighth report.

"The Committee has expressed the hope that the above explanation will help to clarify its procedure in reporting the actions taken on the various cases dealt with during the period covered by the report. It also renewed its appreciation for the Government's co-operation and hopes for the same in the future."

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of replies from Jordan and Liberia the Committee again included those countries in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.
4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Jordan

announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case in connexion with which a reply was still pending after two reminders.

5. On 21 September 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Jordan and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meeting, see the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.

6. Subsequently, a reply dated 14 October 1976 addressed to the Chairman was received from Jordan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note No. PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) dated 13 August 1976 concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia.

"It was stated in that note that the communication of the Committee to my Government received no response. The fact is that the Jordan delegation to the United Nations did transmit in good faith the response of the Government of Jordan in its letter No. 335/105 dated 20 March 1973, and it considered the above communications as sufficient proof of my Government's commitment in complying with the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"I wish to reiterate, Your Excellency, my Government's unequivocal position and its complete and strong support to Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and its pledge of fullest co-operation with the Committee established in pursuance to this resolution.

"I wish to reiterate my assurance to the Committee that the merchandise in question was definitely not of Southern Rhodesian origin. Unfortunately, however, the department of imports and exports, within the Ministry of Trade and Commerce in Jordan, issues licences for statistical purposes only, to aggregate the volume of imports and exports year by year. Such being the case, and with its extremely limited staff and record section, it has been impossible to find the requested documentation, particularly after the lapse of three years since the transaction took place."

7. Further to paragraph 2 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

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

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

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

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

3. In the absence of replies from Jordan and Panama the Committee again included those Governments in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.

4. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

(70) Case No. 236. Steel billets - "Trianon": United Kingdom note dated 23 December 1975

1. By a note dated 23 December 1975 the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of steel billets on the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

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

"The information is to the effect that the MV Trianon was at the port of Lourenço Marques in early October 1975, where she loaded a consignment of approximately 9,000 metric tons of steel billets, manufactured in Rhodesia by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation. The vessel, which is owned by Wilh. Wilhelmsen of Roald Amundsengaten 5, Oslo, Norway, left Lourenço Marques on 19 October 1975 and subsequently put in at Rotterdam on 6 November, where the billets were unloaded for delivery to a Dutch purchaser, Troisdorf. The information also indicates that arrangements for the sale of the billets were made by a firm of the Federal Republic of Germany, Klockner, AG, of Duisburg, acting through a Swiss intermediary, Femetco, AG, of Zug.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of the Netherlands in order to assist them with their inquiries into the possibility that any steel billets unloaded from the MV Trianon at Rotterdam for delivery to Troisdorf were of Southern Rhodesian origin. Should the importer, shipping company or shipping agent claim that the billets were not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may wish to draw attention to his notes PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin and to request the Government of the Netherlands to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the billets are of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Norway so as to assist them with investigations into the shipment in one of their vessels of steel billets suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may further wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Switzerland to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that companies in their territories were concerned in the supply of steel billets of Rhodesian origin to a Dutch importer."

2. At the Committee's request, following informal consultation, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 14 January 1976 to the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland.
3. An acknowledgement dated 19 January 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.
4. A reply dated 12 February 1976 was received from Norway, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The alleged violation of the sanctions on Southern Rhodesia by the MV Trianon, registered in Norway and owned by the Norwegian shipping company Wilh. Wilhelmsen, occurred in October 1975 in connexion with a voyage from Lourenço Marques in Mozambique to Rotterdam in the Netherlands.

"On the voyage from Lourenço Marques to Rotterdam the vessel carried 9,264 tons steel billets and 650 tons chrome ore. The fixture was concluded with Arnhold Wilhelm and Co. (Pty.), Ltd., Johannesburg, as charterers, through Joachim Grieg and Co., Oslo, I. F. Komrowski, Hamburg, and Taurus Shipping Co. (Pty.), Ltd., Johannesburg, as brokers. The steel billets were in direct continuation of previous shipments.

"During the negotiations preceding the conclusion of the fixture, the Norwegian companies Wilh. Wilhelmsen and Joachim Grieg and Co. asked for confirmation as to 'non-Rhodesian origin' of the cargo. This will be seen from the telegraphic communications dated 17 October 1973 and 29 September 1975. Copies of these communications are enclosed.*

"According to telegrams dated 18 October 1973 and 30 September 1975, the charterers confirmed that the cargo was of 'non-Rhodesian origin'. Copies of these communications are enclosed.

"In view of the information set forth above, the Norwegian authorities are confident that Wilh. Wilhelmsen, as well as its Norwegian brokers Joachim Grieg, acted in good faith with regard to the above-mentioned cargo as far as the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia are concerned."

Enclosures

- (i) Telegram dated 17 October 1973

"Att: Herr Lange

"11,500 tons steel billets
"ref. telcon and your telex today

"Enabling us work parcel have contacted the conference of South Africa for their approval. Will revert soonest upon their reply in meantime we take it that parcel of steel billets offered is not Rhodesian cargo."

(ii) Telegram dated 18 October 1973

"We have now the following from Hamburg:

"Charterers reply cargo is of non-Rhodesian origin and are asking whether we have obtained the approval to negotiate the combination."

(iii) Telegram dated 29 September 1975

Trianon compl. cargo

"As agreed upon we have now sent the following to Komrowski, Hamburg:

"Owners confirm booking of 600/650 chrome ore as per your telex today except freight \$US 20.00 per metric ton and subject of course to Rotterdam being confirmed as discharge port for steel billets also provided cargo non-Rhodesian origin. Other relevant terms as per present c/p. Kindly reconfirm soonest enabling owners instruct master. Guidance vessel slightly delayed because of weather. Estimated time of arrival now 5 October and calc load ready 6 Oct. Needless to say owners shall much appreciate charterers continued effort try arrange increased quantity of either steel billets or chrome ore."

(iv) Telegram dated 30 September 1975

"Att: Rolf Jorgensen

"Ref. telephone we have also as mentioned the following from Komrowski:

"Thank you for telex yesterday. Vessel is to discharge steel at Rotterdam therefore booking now reconfirmed as follows:

"Pt cargo 600/650 metric tons chopt bulk chrome ore of non-Rhodesian origin Lourenço Marques to Rotterdam \$US 20 per metric tons flost based out turn weight cqd bends. Loading/discharging same berth as steel cargo and simultaneous with steel cargo. Otherwise basically as c p 3/1/75. Regards."

5. First reminders were sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland on 9 April 1976.

6. A reply dated 27 April 1976 [also covering Case Nos. 239 and 246] has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations ... with reference to Case No. 236, Case No. 239 and Case No. 246 has the honour to communicate the following:

"Three separate external trade audits were conducted at the firm of Klockner AG of Duisburg. None of them produced any indication that the steel billets shipped to Rotterdam, Piraeus and Central America, respectively, were of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The consignments were part of a contract for semi-finished steel products from the Republic of South Africa that Klockner AG concluded with Femetco AG of Zug in 1972. The bills of lading issued by the Camara do Comercio de Lourenço Marques confirmed the origin of the steel billets as being South African.

"As was to be expected, a separate check with the owner of the MS Antje Schulte (Case No. 246) also proved negative."

7. Second reminders were sent to the Netherlands and Switzerland on 10 May 1976.

8. A note dated 1 June 1976 [also covering Case Nos. 239 and 246] was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany under the no-objection procedure, requesting copies of the documents examined by the Federal authorities on the basis of which they had determined the non-Southern Rhodesian origin of the shipments in question, bearing in mind the proper documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

9. Replies were received from Switzerland and the Netherlands, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 1 June 1976 from Switzerland
[also covering Case Nos. 239 and 246]

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's notes of 9 April, 14 April, 4 March and 10 May 1976 concerning cases Nos. 236, 239 and 246, all three relating to the export from Lourenço Marques of steel billets suspected of being of Rhodesian origin. It is assumed that in all three cases the sale of the steel was negotiated by Société Femetco SA, Zoug.

"The concluding of contracts for the delivery of goods which are not to be shipped to or from Swiss territory is not subject to control by the Swiss authorities. These are, in fact, triangular transactions which are not governed by the Swiss authorities, as was explained in detail to the Secretary-General in the Observer's note of 13 May 1974 in connexion with cases Nos. 2 and 103 involving the companies Nitrix SA and Rif Trading Company, Ltd."

(ii) Note dated 7 June 1976 from the Netherlands

"An investigation conducted by the Netherlands authorities has shown that the MV Trianon called at the port of Rotterdam from 6 November till 11 November 1975 where it unloaded 9,000 tons of steel for delivery to the German Federal Republic. It was established that this consignment of steel was taken on board in Maputo and came from South Africa. No data were found that could in any way indicate that this consignment originated from Southern Rhodesia. A Netherlands firm of the name of Troisdorf could not be traced. It was found however, that the Germany company to which the goods were to be delivered had its seat in the village of Troisdorf. It can therefore be assumed that the seat of this company was mistaken for the name of the intermediary or agent in the Netherlands."

10. A note dated 30 July 1976 was sent to the Netherlands under the no-objection procedure, inquiring what means had been used by the Netherlands authorities to determine the non-Southern Rhodesian origin of the shipment in question and whether the authorities could at least indicate the type of documents examined, if any, bearing in mind the proper documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

11. A reply dated 23 September 1976 [also covering Case Nos. 239, 246 and 265] was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations ... has the honour to communicate the following:

"Although the movement of commodities, invisibles, capital and payments and other business between the Federal Republic of Germany and foreign economic territories is, in principle, free under the foreign trade regulations in force in the Federal Republic of Germany, the Federal Government has given due regard to the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations against Southern Rhodesia by amending its foreign trade ordinance and by subjecting economic transactions with Southern Rhodesia to a general licensing requirement, decreeing at the same time that such licences, in principle, shall not be granted. Pursuant to Security Council resolution 388 (1976), another amendment to the foreign trade regulations is in preparation.

"As far as the business transactions in question are concerned, the Republic of South Africa had been declared as the country of origin of these commodities. Consequently, the transactions were not subject to licensing. Nevertheless, once the Federal Government received information from the Sanctions Committee pointing to the possible Southern Rhodesian origin of the steel billets, it arranged for an external trade audit to be conducted in each instance by auditors furnished with judicial powers. In addition, it tried to have the origin of the steel billets established by chemical analysis. To this end, it enlisted the help of the British Government, whose Department of Trade and Industry - Laboratory of the Government Chemist -, in a letter of 2 October 1975 - Econ 2(5) 2/75 -, replied as follows to the request of the Federal Government:

'We have consulted the Institute of Geological Sciences and also the British Steel Corporation as to whether the country of origin of these products can be ascertained by means of chemical analysis (including modern instrumental methods). Our advise is that this is not possible nowadays as modern steel technology is designed to eliminate all unwanted inclusions in the production of a uniform composition. I am sorry that our efforts have not produced a more helpful result.'

"While the audited firm is legally bound to produce all business records and to supply information relating to its business transactions, the proof that the origin of a commodity differs from the declared origin has to be furnished by the examining administrative authority. In other words, under the legal system of the Federal Republic of Germany the burden of proof of the actual origin of the commodity is not incumbent upon the audited firm but on the examining authorities and - after proceedings have been initiated - the courts.

"In none of the cases in question have the audited business records, which have conscientiously been examined by the auditors, made it possible to furnish such proof.

"The external trade audit carried out with reference to Case No. 265 (MV Alesandros Skoutaris) has likewise failed to produce any indication of a possible Southern Rhodesian origin of the steel billets."

12. At its 281st meeting the Committee considered as a group this and the other four cases arising out of Case No. 171 (RISCO), namely Case Nos. 239, 246, 265 and 266, by virtue of the common elements linking them. The Committee noted for instance that the cases involved resale abroad of steel products suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin through the co-ordination of particular firms in the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland. That element, the Committee recalled, was one of the plans agreed upon by its creditors, as reported in Case No. 171, a/ under which the Southern Rhodesian Iron and Steel Company expected to repay the capital funds obtained abroad for its expansion. Firms in other countries that finally purchased the steel products in question were assured by the co-ordinating firm in the Federal Republic of Germany that the products were of South African origin and sometimes that firm offered a certificate of origin to that effect issued by the Lower Rhine Chamber of Industry and Commerce. The Committee expressed concern that bona fide purchasers in other countries might inadvertently be buying the suspected products without the knowledge that such products might be unaccompanied by conclusive documentary evidence attesting to their declared origin.

13. Accordingly, at the same meeting, the Committee decided that a note should be sent to the Federal Republic of Germany requesting that Government to obtain from the firm concerned additional and more conclusive evidence, apart from the certificate of origin issued by the Lower Rhine Chamber of Industry and Commerce, that the steel products actually came from South Africa. It was further decided that a summary of the cases should be made showing Switzerland's involvement; such a summary would then be considered by the Committee and might be the basis of a special note to that Government. Meanwhile, the Chairman was requested to make personal contact with the Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations and discuss these cases with him. The Committee also decided to seek information from Mozambique sources, particularly through the co-operation of the United Nations resident representative in that country, as to what extent, if at all, it was normal practice to channel through the port of Maputo for export steel products manufactured in South Africa.

(71) Case No. 239. Steel billets - "MS Shinkai Maru": United Kingdom note dated 14 January 1976

1. By a note dated 14 January 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning a consignment of steel billets shipped to Greece. The text of the note is reproduced below.

a/ See S/11597, para. 2, and annex II, A, para. 7.

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

"The information is to the effect that the MS Shinkai Maru was at the port of Lourenço Marques in the latter half of August 1975, where she loaded a consignment of approximately 6,000 metric tons of steel billets, manufactured in Rhodesia by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation. The vessel, which is owned by the Uwajima Shosen KK of Japan, left Lourenço Marques on charter to Tokyo Kaiji KK on 28 August 1975, and subsequently put in at the port of Piraeus on 19 September 1975, where the billets were unloaded for delivery to a Greek purchaser. Tokyo Kaiji KK are understood to have entered into the shipping contract through their London agent, Thos. Mann and Son, Ltd. The Government of the United Kingdom are investigating this aspect of the transaction. The information also indicates that arrangements for the sale of the billets were made by a firm of the Federal Republic of Germany, Klockner AG of Duisburg, acting through a Swiss intermediary, Fermetco AG of Zug. The Dileship Company of Piraeus acted as shipping agents for the consignment.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Greece in order to assist them with their enquiries into the possibility that any steel billets unloaded from the MS Shinkai Maru at Piraeus for delivery to a Greek company were of Southern Rhodesian origin. Should the importer, shipping company or shipping agent claim that the billets were not of Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may wish to draw attention to his notes PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin, and to request the Government of Greece to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the billets were of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Japan so as to assist them with their investigations into the shipment in one of their vessels of steel billets suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may further wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Switzerland to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that companies in their territories were concerned in the supply of steel billets of Rhodesian origin to a Greek importer."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 6 February 1976 were sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece and Japan, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon. The Committee also sent a similar note dated 12 February 1976 to Switzerland.

3. Replies were received from Greece and Japan, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 23 February 1976 from Greece

"The Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to request /the Secretary-General/ to advise the Security Council Committee that, as reported by the competent port authorities in Greece, 2,218 parcels containing 19,962 steel billets and weighing 5,925,100 kg were unloaded at Piraeus from the MS Shinkai Maru to be delivered to the Hellenic Steel Mills, Inc. According to the ship's cargo manifest the billets were of non-Rhodesian origin."

(ii) Note dated 16 March 1976 from Japan

"The Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the Government of Japan, after having obtained information about the case from Tokyo Kaiji KK, has learned the following:

"1. The MS Shinkai Maru arrived at the port of Lourenço Marques on 21 August 1975 and left there on 28 August 1975, having loaded a consignment of approximately 6,000 metric tons of steel billets. She entered the port of Elefsis on 18 September 1975, where she unloaded the consignment in question, and left there on 28 September 1975.

"2. Tokyo Kaiji KK had concluded a contract for shipping the said consignment on the London market (Baltic Exchange) by telex through its agent in London, Mann and Son, Ltd.

"3. It should be noted that, according to the prevailing practice on the Baltic Exchange, a shipper is not able to know the details concerning sales contracts of commodities transacted on the Exchange.

"4. In loading consignments abroad, however, Tokyo Kaiji KK had paid particular attention in order to prevent the loading of a consignment of Southern Rhodesian origin. Tokyo Kaiji KK thus took the maximum precautions as a shipper, as it has done consistently in such cases, and, bearing in mind the fact that the consignment of steel billets in question had nothing to indicate in any way that was suspected of being Southern Rhodesian in origin, shipped the consignment in question.

"Under the present circumstances, and in the absence of documentary evidence or any other information to contradict the above-mentioned findings, the Government of Japan considers that the consignment in question was not of Southern Rhodesian origin but of South African origin. The Government of Japan, however, is prepared to keep this matter under review and will provide the Committee with further information concerning this case in the event that it comes to light."

4. A note dated 23 March 1976 was sent to Greece under the no-objection procedure, requesting copies of the documents examined by the Greek investigating authorities, on the basis of which they had determined the non-Southern Rhodesian origin of the shipment in question, bearing in mind the proper documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

5. First reminders were sent to the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland on 14 April 1976 and to Greece on 26 April 1976.
6. A note dated 27 April 1976, similar to that indicated in paragraph 4 above, was sent to Japan under the no-objection procedure.
7. A reply dated 27 April 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 6 of (70) Case No. 236 above.
8. A second reminder was sent to Switzerland on 18 May 1976.
9. A reply dated 19 May 1976 was received from Greece enclosing copies of two documents: a certificate of origin of the European Community issued by the Lower Rhine Chamber of Industry and Commerce of Duisburg-Wesel and a statement of merchandise imports issued by Dileship and Co., Ltd., Piraeus and certified by the Inspection Service of Customs Authorities of Athens. The substantive part of the reply reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to transmit herewith a certificate of origin indicating that the steel billet consignment referred to in the above-said note derives from South Africa, as well as a statement of merchandise imports issued by the Greek Customs Authorities of Eleusis proving the import of the above consignment in Greece from South Africa."

10. The attached documents, analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant, declared South Africa to be the origin of the cargo of steel billets, weighing 5,925,100 kilograms and shipped from Lourenço Marques to Eleusis, Greece, aboard the MS Shinkai Maru. It was pointed out to the Committee that it was unusual that the certificate of origin had been issued by the chamber of commerce of the consignor and not by the declared country of origin itself. Such a certificate could not be regarded as sufficient proof of origin of the shipment. The Committee might therefore wish to ask the countries involved to submit other documentation than the ones already submitted in order to enable it to determine the true origin of the shipment in question.
11. A note dated 1 June 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany under the no-objection procedure, stating as indicated in paragraph 8 of (70) Case No. 239 above.
12. Replies were received from Japan, Switzerland and the Netherlands, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

- (i) Note dated 1 June 1976 /also covering Case Nos. 239 and 246/ from Switzerland

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's notes of 9 April, 14 April, 4 March and 10 May 1976 concerning cases Nos. 236, 239 and 246, all three relating to the export from Lourenço Marques of steel billets suspected of being of Rhodesian origin. It is assumed that in all three cases the sale of the steel was negotiated by Soci  t   Femetco SA, Zoug.

"The concluding of contracts for the delivery of goods which are not to be shipped to or from Swiss territory is not subject to control by the Swiss authorities. These are, in fact, triangular transactions which are not governed by the Swiss authorities, as was explained in detail to the Secretary-General in the Observer's note of 13 May 1974 in connexion with cases Nos. 2 and 103 involving the companies Nitrex SA and Rif Trading Company, Ltd."

(ii) Note dated 4 June 1976 from Japan, enclosing copy of the same certificate of origin referred to and analysed in paragraphs 9 and 10 above

"The Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations ... has the honour to forward herewith a copy of the certificate of origin which attests that the consignment of goods in question were of South African origin.

"As was stated in our note SC/76/73 dated 16 March 1976, the contract for the shipment of the steel billets in question was entered by a British company in London, Mann and Son, Ltd., which is an agent of the carrier, Tokyo Kaiji KK. Mann and Son, Ltd., supplied Tokyo Kaiji KK with a copy of the above certificate. The certificate was issued by the consignor, K. Lochner and Co. of the Federal Republic of Germany to the consignee Hellniki Halyvousighia of Greece and was endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Duisburg and by the Consulate-General of Dusseldorf.

"The Permanent Representative of Japan has further the honour to restate that the submission to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of a document which involves trade secrets does not always fall within the sole competence of the Government of Japan and may require the consent of the Japanese firms involed."

(iii) Note dated 7 June 1976 from the Netherlands

"An investigation conducted by the Netherlands authorities has shown that the MV Trianon called at the port of Rotterdam from 6 November till 11 November 1975 where it unloaded 9,000 tons of steel for delivery to the German Federal Republic. It was established that this consignment of steel was taken on board in Maputo and came from South Africa. No data were found that could in any way indicate that this consignment originated from Southern Rhodesia. A Netherlands firm of the name of Troisdorf could not be traced. It was found however, that the German company to which the goods were to be delivered had its seat in the village of Troisdorf. It can therefore be assumed that the seat of this company was mistaken for the name of the intermediary or agent in the Netherlands."

13. The Committee considered the case at the 276th meeting on 22 July 1976 and decided that an appropriate note should be prepared for its consideration at the next meeting for transmission to Japan, requesting further documentary evidence in respect of the shipment of steel billets claimed to be of South African origin. At the same meeting the representative of Japan indicated that he might be able to make a statement on the matter at the next meeting of the Committee.

14. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the representative of Japan made a statement on the matter, in view of which the proposed note to Japan was not sent. The text of that statement is reproduced below:

"At the 276th meeting, I requested your permission for me to come back with replies in the next meeting concerning the issue of Shinkai Maru on the grounds that I had not acquainted myself with the details of that particular issue. I should now like to make my delegation's comments on two points:

"1. Certificate of origin

"(1) My delegation submitted a copy of the certificate of origin with an intention to show that the shipping company had a good reason to believe that the goods were of South African origin. And a comment was made by the secretariat, and also by the distinguished representative of Tanzania, to the effect that the document should not be regarded as an authentic one and that the parties concerned should be asked to supply further documentation.

"(2) In this regard, I should like to state my delegation's view concerning the status of the submitted document in relation to the shipping company involved, namely, Tokyo Kaiji KK.

"(3) It must be clear by now from the replies my delegation has submitted to the Committee in the past that Tokyo Kaiji KK has concluded a contract for shipping by telex and, therefore, it was not in a position to see physically the certificate of origin or its copy at that stage.

"Secondly, Tokyo Kaiji KK, while being attentive to the problem of goods originating from Southern Rhodesia, received no indication at the stage of loading consignments that the goods were of Southern Rhodesian origin. To the contrary, it acted in the belief that the goods were of South African origin. This shipping company has submitted the copy of the certificate it obtained only to show that it was right in believing that the goods were of South African origin, and not of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"(4) The Committee may be right in seeking such kind of certificate of origin as it may deem authentic in accordance with its own criterion to serve its own purposes. However, the requirement on and practices in the certificate of origin may differ from country to country, and from purpose to purpose.

"My delegation believes that the shipping company had a good reason to believe, in accordance with their business practices, that the goods were of South African origin on the basis of the already submitted document.

"(5) The Committee may seek the parties concerned for further presentation of documents. But, as far as this shipping company is concerned it has already submitted the document which made it believe what the country of origin was, whether or not it may be considered by the Committee to be an 'authentic' one in accordance with the Committee's concept. And if the company is asked for further documentation, all it will be able to do will be to request the consignor, for example, to provide one and merely pass it on to my Government. It would not be meaningful to do so.

"(6) Therefore, if the Committee seeks further documentation, it should do so from pertinent parties.

"2. Trade secrets

"(1) My delegation stated in its latest reply that the submission to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of a document which involves trade secrets does not always fall within the sole competence of the Japanese Government and may require the consent of the Japanese firms involved.

"(2) To this statement, the distinguished representative of Tanzania stated to the effect that this paragraph should be unacceptable on the grounds that the company suspected of the breach of sanctions might not necessarily agree to surrender confidential documentation.

"(3) In the first place, that particular paragraph of my delegation's reply should not be interpreted by any standard as if it showed any lack of willingness or readiness on the part of my Government to co-operate with the Committee in a most positive manner. That statement contains nothing other than factual presentation.

"(4) Secondly, my delegation believes that the Committee may well be and should be aware of a difficulty which a Member State may have to face in co-operating with this Committee's work.

"The Committee should pay attention to such difficulties of Member States as much as possible, and so far as it is possible to pursue its purposes without causing such a difficulty as may be appealed by a Member State, it should do so and it had better do so, because in doing so the Committee may be able to obtain better results without causing unnecessary difficulties.

"(5) Therefore, my delegation does not agree to issue a note to the Japanese Government to the effect that this paragraph is unacceptable to the Committee."

15. A reply dated 23 September 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 11 of (70) Case No. 236 above.

16. At the 278th meeting on 4 November 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement to the Committee, the text of which is reproduced below:

"I am now in a position to report the results of the investigation forecast in the note submitted by my delegation on what became known as Case 239, in which the Committee will remember a Japanese shipping company entered into a shipping contract through their London agents, Thos. Mann and Son, Ltd.

"I have available for the Committee copies of the Charter Party document, from which it will be seen that the shipping agents for Arnhold Wilhelmi were Taurus Shipping of Johannesburg. Mann and Son further told the Department of Trade Investigators that the agents in Greece were Dile Shipping Co., Ltd., of Pireaus. Mann sought confirmation from Dile as to the origin of the steel billets and were sent a certified copy of a certificate of South African origin issued by the Niederrheinische Industrie- und Handelskammer, Duisburg-Wesel, a copy of which I am also making available.

"The Charter Party was duly negotiated in London by Mann and Son with Glover Brothers (London), Ltd. The story now becomes a little complicated, because Glover was acting for Komrowski Befrachtungsktor KG of Hamburg, who in turn were agents for Taurus of Johannesburg. Komrowski have been regular clients of Glover for many years and have provided Glover with a blanket assurance that no charters involving the carriage of goods to or from Southern Rhodesia would be offered for charter in the United Kingdom. To the best of Glover's knowledge this undertaking had always been respected

"The final document I have for submission is Glover's notice of freight requirements for 7 August 1975 which includes the cargo in question as well as three other offers for shipment of steel billets from Durban or Lourenço Marques. This indicates that no secrecy surrounded the chartering

"On the basis of their full investigation of documents and their interviews with senior officials of the British companies involved, the United Kingdom investigators concluded that the British ship-brokers had not knowingly been party to any contravention of article 3(i) of the Southern Rhodesia (United Nations sanctions) (No. 2) Order of 1968. No proceedings are therefore envisaged.

"I am also instructed to say that the United Kingdom firms have taken note of the overseas companies b/ involved in this transaction with a view to avoiding a similar inadvertent breach of the sanctions order in the future."

17. The documentary evidence submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom consisted of copies of the charter agreement between Tokyo Shipping Company and Arnold, Wilhelmi and Co. (Pty.), Ltd., of Johannesburg, South Africa copy of the same certificate of origin as that referred to and analysed in paragraphs 9 and 10 above, and copy of the notice of freight requirements, which included the cargo in question.

18. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 12 and 13 of (70) Case No. 236 above.

(72) Case No. 246. Steel billets - "Antje Schulte": United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1976

1. By a note dated 13 February 1976, the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of steel billets on the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that consignments of steel billets shipped to El Salvador and Guatemala were of Southern Rhodesian origin.

b/ At the 284th meeting of the Committee the representative of the United Kingdom confirmed that the foreign companies referred to in his statement include only those companies involved in previous cases of alleged breaches of sanction which had been brought to the attention of the Committee.

"The information is to the effect that the MS Antje Schulte was at the port of Lourenço Marques in late October 1975 where she loaded a consignment of approximately 7,000 metric tons of steel billets, manufactured in Rhodesia by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation. The vessel, which is owned by Bernard Schulte of Vorsetzen 54, 2 Hamburg 11, Federal Republic of Germany, left Lourenço Marques on 2 November 1975 and subsequently put in at Porto Cutuco (La Unión), El Salvador where approximately 3,000 tons of the billets were discharged and later at Acajutla, also in El Salvador, where a further 2,000 tons were discharged. The ship then repassed the Panama Canal and put in at Santo Thomas De Castilla in Guatemala where the remaining 2,000 tons of billets were unloaded. The information also indicates that arrangements for the sale of the billets were made by a firm of the Federal Republic of Germany, Klockner AG of Duisburg, acting through a Swiss intermediary, Femetco AG of Zug.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Governments of El Salvador and Guatemala in order to assist them with their inquiries into the possibility that steel billets unloaded from the Antje Schulte at Porto Cutuco (La Unión), Acajutla and Santo Thomas De Castilla were of Southern Rhodesian origin. Should the importer, shipping company or shipping agent claim that the billets were not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may wish to draw attention to his notes PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin, and to request the Governments of El Salvador and Guatemala to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the billets are of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Switzerland to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that companies in their territories were concerned in the supply of steel billets suspected to be of Rhodesian origin to importers in El Salvador and Guatemala, and, in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany, into the shipment of this cargo in one of their vessels."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, notes were sent to the Federal Republic of Germany (26 February 1976) and to Switzerland, Guatemala and El Salvador (4 March 1976), transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 24 March 1976 was received from El Salvador, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I should like to bring to your attention the information which I have received from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs states that the Salvadorian authorities have made a thorough investigation of the report in question and that 'it has been definitely ascertained that the cargo of steel mentioned by Her Britannic Majesty's Government was not imported from Southern Rhodesia and that consequently there has been no violation of the provisions laid down by the United Nations Security Council with regard to the question of Southern Rhodesia'."

4. A note dated 26 April 1976 was sent to El Salvador under the no-objection procedure, requesting copies of the documents examined by the El Salvador investigating authorities, on the basis of which they had determined the non-Southern Rhodesian origin of the shipment in question, bearing in mind the proper documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.
5. A reply dated 27 April 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany for the substantive part of which see paragraph 6 of (70) Case No. 236 above.
6. First reminders were sent to Guatemala and Switzerland on 18 May 1976.
7. A reply dated 21 July 1976 was received from El Salvador, enclosing documentary evidence. The substantive part of the reply reads as follows:

"With reference to your note of 23 June 1976 (Case No. 246), I am able to inform you that I have received the following communication from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of El Salvador:

'I have the honour to refer to your note dated 30 June 1976, to which you attached a copy of the note from the Secretary-General of the United Nations requesting information on the purchase of steel billets, allegedly originating from Southern Rhodesia, by El Salvador. In this connexion I am able to inform you that we verbally contacted the Office of the Director-General of Customs of El Salvador and ACEROS, SA requesting any documentary information that might confirm the origin of the steel in question. In reply, the following information was received. El Salvador does not require an official certificate of origin for steel. The purchase of the steel was made from the firm Klockner and Co. of the Federal Republic of Germany, which states that the products came from South Africa. As sole evidence they sent an invoice showing that the material was loaded on board at Lourenço Marques and is of South African origin. In this kind of negotiation the purchaser is never informed of the country of origin of the steel, since the transaction is conducted through intermediaries. In view of the foregoing I have to inform you that it is almost impossible to produce any other kind of evidence in support of the contention that the steel is truly of South African origin. We have asked ACEROS, SA to demand an official certificate of origin in further transactions, to avoid any future problems of this nature. I enclose a copy of the aforesaid commercial invoice. In accordance with instructions I would request you kindly to take the necessary steps to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the action taken by El Salvador in accordance with the principle of faithful compliance with United Nations resolutions.'

"In addition, I am sending you a photocopy of the above-mentioned invoices."

8. The enclosed document, analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant, was a certificate of origin issued by Klockner and Co., a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany, declaring South Africa to be the origin of the steel billets, weighing 2,938.237 metric tons and valued at \$US 496,562.05 c.i.f. The cargo had been shipped from Durban to Porto Cutuco (La Unión), El Salvador, aboard the

MS Antje Schulte. It was pointed out to the Committee that, as also indicated in paragraph 10 of (71) Case No. 239, above, the certificate of origin had been issued by the consignor, Klockner and Co., and not by the declared country of origin itself. Such a certificate could not be regarded as sufficient proof of origin. Moreover no documentary evidence had been submitted by El Salvador with regard to the other cargo of about 2,000 tons of steel billets reported by the United Kingdom to have been shipped to El Salvador.

9. A third reminder was sent to Guatemala on 30 July 1976.

10. A reply dated 3 August 1976 was received from Guatemala, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations ... with reference to the Secretary-General's note (Case No. 246), has the honour to inform him that, following thorough investigations carried out in Guatemala, it has been possible to establish conclusively that the Government of Guatemala did not import the 2,000 tons of steel billets of Southern Rhodesian origin referred to in the note sent to the Security Council Committee."

11. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case see paragraphs 12 and 13 of (70) Case No. 236 above.

(73) Case No. 265. Steel billets - "Alesandros Skoutaris": United Kingdom note dated 19 May 1976

1. By a note dated 19 May 1976, the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of steel billets on the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

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

"The information is to the effect that the motor vessel Alesandros Skoutaris was at the port of Lourenço Marques (Maputo) in early February 1976, where she loaded a consignment of 11,250 tons of steel billets, manufactured in Rhodesia by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation. The vessel, which is owned by the Clio Shipping Company, Ltd., of Nicosia, Cyprus, a subsidiary of the Atlantis Shipping and Commercial Company, Ltd., 3rd floor, 9 Filellinon Street, Pireaus, Greece, left Lourenço Marques (Maputo) on 17 February 1976 and subsequently put in at the port of Izmir in Turkey, where 3,750 tons were discharged for delivery to Yutcu Demir Sanayi Ve Ticaret Koll. Şti., Gazi Bulvari 57/3, Izmir. The importer was Türkiye İş Bankası AS of Izmir. The ship then sailed on to Istanbul, where the remainder of the cargo was discharged: 3,750 tons for delivery to Ferro Celik Sanayi Ve Ticaret Koll. Şti., Tersane Caddesi, Izsal Han No. 25, Karakoy, Istanbul. The importer of this consignment was Akbank T.A.S., P.O. Box 1221, Karakoy. The remaining 3,750 tons was discharged for delivery to Yilmaz Ozdemir Ve Biraderleri Koll. Şti., Kizilay Caddesi 44, Karabuk, Zonguldak. The importer in this case was again Türkiye İş Bankası AS of

Istanbul. The information also indicates that arrangements for the sale of the billets were made by a firm of the Federal Republic of Germany, Klockner AG of Duisburg, acting through a Swiss intermediary, Fermetco AG of Zug, and a South African intermediary, Southern Transvaal Steel (Pty), Ltd., of Johannesburg.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Turkey in order to assist them with their inquiries into the possibility that steel billets unloaded at Izmir and Istanbul were of Southern Rhodesian origin. The Secretary-General may wish to draw attention to his notes PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin, and to request the Government of Turkey to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the billets are of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Governments of Cyprus and Greece to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that a Cypriot-registered vessel owned by companies in their territories carried steel billets of Rhodesian origin to ports in Turkey.

"The Committee may further wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Switzerland to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that companies in their territories were also concerned in the supply of steel billets of Rhodesian origin to importers in Turkey."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 4 June 1976 were sent to Cyprus, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Switzerland and Turkey, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. Acknowledgements dated 10 June 1976 were received from Switzerland and Turkey.
4. First reminders were sent to Cyprus, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece and Turkey on 9 August 1976 and a note dated 16 August 1976 was sent to Switzerland requesting the results of the investigations as promised in the communication dated 10 June 1976.
5. A reply dated 16 August 1976 was received from Turkey, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Investigations were initiated by the relevant Turkish authorities, on the basis of the note of 19 May 1976 by the Government of the United Kingdom addressed to the Security Council Committee. These investigations have produced evidence that no currency transfer has been effected to any firm of Southern Rhodesian origin and that import licenses for 7,500 tons of consignment from the Federal Republic of Germany were granted to each of the firms mentioned in the United Kingdom's letter during the period between 4 January 1975 to 1 February 1976.

"During the investigations it has been established that import licenses with payments by letter of credit were issued by the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey to three Turkish firms, namely, Yurtçu Demir ve Sanayi Kollektif Şirketi, Ferro Çelik Sanayi ve Ticaret Limited Sirketi, Yılmaz Ozdemir ve Biraderli Şirketi. In all of these licences, the Federal Republic of Germany was indicated as the country of origin of the consignment and of the currency transfer.

"The Permanent Representative of Turkey would wish to inform further that the investigations have not yet been concluded and additional findings will be conveyed as soon as they are received.

"In transmitting this information to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Permanent Representative of Turkey has the honour to reaffirm that the Government of Turkey has consistently complied with the resolutions of the United Nations concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia. Accordingly, Turkey has no political, diplomatic or consular relations with the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and has banned all trade and economic relations with it."

6. A note dated 9 September 1976 was sent to Turkey under the no-objection procedure, requesting copies of the documents examined by the Turkish investigating authorities, on the basis of which they had determined the non-Southern Rhodesian origin of the shipment in question, bearing in mind the proper documentation recommended in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

7. A reply dated 13 September 1976 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 communicate that the Ministry of Mercantile Marine cannot provide further information on the vessel Alesandros Skoutaris because it flies the Cypriot flag and is owned by a Cypriot company, namely the Clio Shipping Co.

"Nevertheless, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs has asked the competent Greek authorities to conduct an investigation in order to find out if and what relations exist between the above Cypriot company and the Atlantis Shipping Co., which is referred to in the above note of the Secretary-General."

8. Second reminders were sent to Cyprus, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland on 24 September 1976.

9. A reply dated 23 September, which crossed with the second reminder sent to that Government on 24 September 1976, was received from the Federal Republic of Germany. For the substantive part of that reply, see paragraph 11 of (70) Case No. 236 above.

10. An acknowledgement dated 4 October 1976 was received from Cyprus to the second reminder sent by the Committee on 24 September 1976.

11. For other relevant information concerning the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 12 and 13 of (70) Case No. 236 above.

12. A reply dated 14 December 1976 was received from Turkey, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"On 16 August 1976, on the instructions of the Turkish Government, the Permanent Representative of Turkey was able to inform the Secretary-General that the investigations undertaken by the competent Turkish authorities in connexion with the above-mentioned case had established that during the period between 4 January 1975 to 1 February 1976, import licences had been granted to each of the three Turkish firms in question, that is, Yurtcu Demir Sanayi Kollektif Sirketi, Ferro Celic Sanayi ve Ticaret Limited Sirketi and Yilmaz Ozdemir ve Biraderleri Sirketi, for 7,500 tons of consignment from a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany. The competent Turkish authorities had also established that no currency transfer whatsoever had been effected to any firm in Southern Rhodesia at any time.

"Since then the Turkish authorities have continued to pursue the matter and have made detailed inquiries with all the government offices in a position to provide useful information. As a result of the time-consuming and thorough examination, it has not been possible for the Turkish Government to respond to the Committee's note of 9 September within the requested period of one month.

"The competent Turkish authorities have now concluded that the Turkish firms in question were engaged in legal commercial transactions entailing currency transfer to the Federal Republic of Germany. After a conscientious examination of all the relevant business records no evidence was found indicating in any way that the said companies were involved in commercial transactions in contravention of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. It is understood that the Turkish firms in question have in good faith purchased the steel billets from Klockner and Co., of Duisburg, Federal Republic of Germany.

"In this connexion, the Permanent Representative of Turkey wishes to reiterate that the Turkish Government has always supported, and is determined to continue to implement, the measures taken by the Security Council vis-à-vis the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. These measures, it may be recalled, were codified by the Turkish Government by its decree of 18 November 1968, the text of which was communicated to the Secretariat of the United Nations by our note No. 1519/1019 of 13 December 1968.

"If the Committee has any documentary evidence that would enable the Turkish competent authorities to undertake investigations of a judicial nature the Government of Turkey would appreciate receiving such. In the absence of documentary proof establishing a contravention of the sanctions established by the Security Council and the above-mentioned decree by the Turkish Government dated 18 November 1968, the Turkish Government regrets not to be able to be of further assistance to the Committee."

(74) Case No. 266 Steel billets - "MV Aristides Xilas": United Kingdom note dated 17 May 1976

1. By a note dated 17 May 1976, the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of steel billets on the above-mentioned vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The information is to the effect that, during the first three weeks of January 1976, the MV Aristides Xilas was at the port of Lourenço Marques where she loaded 10,000 tons of steel billets manufactured in Rhodesia by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation. The vessel, which is owned by the Exorimsis Shipping Company SA of Panama, but sailing under a Greek flag, left Lourenço Marques on 21 January and subsequently put in at the port of Aqaba in Jordan, where the steel billets were unloaded for delivery to a Jordanian purchaser. The information also indicates that the arrangements for the sale of the billets were made by a firm of the Federal Republic of Germany, Klockner AG of Duisburg, acting through Femetco AG of Zug in Switzerland, and Southern Transvaal Steel (Pty) of Johannesburg.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Jordan in order to assist them with their enquiries. The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to draw the above information to the attention of the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that companies in their territories were concerned in the supply of steel billets of Rhodesian origin to a Jordanian importer."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 8 June 1976 were sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, Jordan and Switzerland, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. An acknowledgement dated 10 June 1976 was received from Switzerland.

4. A reply dated 22 June 1976 has been received from Jordan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent Jordanian authorities, after thorough investigation of their records, have confirmed that no license has been issued for the import of 10,000 tons of steel billets from Southern Rhodesia. They have also established that they cannot possibly find out if the merchandise imported from a certain country had been originally manufactured in another country, as long as the merchandise is accompanied by a legal certificate of origin of the exporting country.

"The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, in a Cabinet decision on 29 November 1965, has enforced embargo on all kinds of trade with Southern Rhodesia. All concerned authorities strictly observe this policy and they have never given permission to the import or export of any merchandise to or from Southern Rhodesia since the aforesaid date.

"The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan takes this opportunity to reaffirm its complete and strong support to Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and its pledge of fullest co-operation with the Committee established in pursuance of this resolution."

5. First and second reminders were sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 10 August and 13 September 1976, respectively.

6. An acknowledgement dated 20 September 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating that investigations were still under way and that the results would be conveyed to the Committee as soon as possible.

7. A note dated 20 October 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany inquiring whether the investigations were complete and the results could be forwarded to the Committee.

8. A reply dated 21 October 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's notes of 4 June, 8 June, 16 August and 24 September 1976 concerning Case Nos. 265 and 266, which relate to the export from Maputo of steel billets suspected of being of Rhodesian origin. In both cases, the sale of the steel is said to have been negotiated through Femetco AG, Zug.

"As was explained to the Secretary-General in detail in the Observer's note of 13 May 1974 concerning Case Nos. 2 and 103 (Nitrex SA and Rif Trading Company, Ltd.), the Swiss authorities have no control over triangular transactions. The conclusion of contracts relating to shipments of goods not bound for or originating in Swiss territory are not subject to control by the Swiss Government.

"The Federal authorities did, however, contact Femetco to ask for its comments on the allegations made by the Committee. Mr. Rolf Egli, chairman of the company's board of directors, stated categorically that he had no knowledge of the transactions in question."

9. For other relevant information concerning the action taken on this case, see paragraphs 12 and 13 of (70) Case No. 236 above.

10. A further note dated 8 December 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, stating that the external audit performed in connexion with the present case was still in progress; as soon as the investigation had been concluded, the findings would be communicated to the Committee without delay.

Graphite

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

See annex IV.

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

See annex IV.

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

See annex IV.

B. MINERAL FUELS

(78) Case No. 172. Crude oil: United Kingdom note date 7 May 1974

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

C. TOBACCO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 Case No. USI-37, in annex III below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. In the absence of replies from Panama and Zambia, the Committee again included those Governments in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.

4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Zambia, announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.

5. An acknowledgement dated 17 August 1976 was received from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of Zambia to the United Nations, advising that the matter had again been referred to the relevant authorities in Zambia and that, as soon as a reply was received, it would be communicated to the Chairman.

6. At the time of preparation of the present report, the proposed meeting between the Chairman and the Permanent Representative of Zambia had not yet taken place.

7. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III, below.

8. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Zambia in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 6 April 1976.

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 271st meeting, a note dated 12 July 1976 was sent to the Netherlands, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"At its 271st meeting, the Committee considered the above-mentioned case and had before it the information given by the Government in His Excellency's notes dated 31 October and 8 December 1975. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the co-operation of the Netherlands authorities in undertaking the requested investigations. In the case of the MV Streefkerk the Committee was particularly gratified to learn of the action taken by the authorities against the director of the Rotterdam firm found guilty of importing Southern Rhodesian tobacco, albeit for transshipment to another country. The Committee would welcome information on the outcome of the Government's appeal against the lightness of the sentence imposed against the director.

"With regard to the MV Swellendam, the Committee, while appreciating that the documents examined belonged to South African companies, felt that at least their nature and identity could be divulged, since such information must be known to the Netherlands authorities. The Committee wishes to remain in no doubt that only authentic and proper documents are made available to the investigating authorities. It expressed the hope therefore that, in forwarding

the further information now requested the investigating authorities will take into account the proper documentary evidence recommended in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

The Committee would appreciate receiving a reply from His Excellency's Government at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included South Africa in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 August 1976.
6. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent by the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of South Africa announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case, among others, in connexion with which replies were pending after three reminders.
7. At the time of preparation of the present report the proposed meeting between the Chairman and the Permanent Representative of South Africa had not yet taken place.
8. A first reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 24 September 1976.
9. A reply dated 29 September 1976 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As has been already communicated in the Permanent Representative's note of 31 October 1975 No. 6860, the District Attorney of Rotterdam appealed the judgement of the District Court of Rotterdam of 30 September 1975 with regard to the MV Streefkerk by which a Rotterdam firm was fined, as he could not agree with the Court's decision not to impose an additional penalty.

"The Appeals Court of The Hague reversed the judgement of the District Court, acquitted the accused firm and ordered the impounded shipment of tobacco returned to the Swiss importer.

"The judgement of the Appeals Court, in its turn, was not upheld by the Supreme Court of the Netherlands which remanded the case to the Appeals Court of Amsterdam. A final judgement by this Court has not yet been passed.

"With regard to the question raised in relation to the MV Swellendam, the Permanent Representative has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the certificates of origin submitted to the investigating authorities in the Netherlands were issued by the Malawi Tobacco Control Commission in Malawi, the Associacio Commercial da Beira and the British Consul at Beira.

"The Permanent Representative takes this opportunity to reaffirm once again that the Netherlands authorities take considerable pains to look into any possible violations of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia as conscientiously as possible. To the regret of the Netherlands Government, however, documents from which the origin of goods can be ascertained without any shadow of doubt are not always available to the investigating authorities."

10. Notes dated 13 December 1976 were sent to Malawi and the United Kingdom, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting the information received from the Netherlands with regard to the MV Swellendam and requesting assurance and verification from the appropriate authorities that the certificates of origin referred to in the Netherlands reply had indeed been issued by those authorities in respect of the shipment of tobacco in question. No similar note was sent to Mozambique or Portugal on account that certificates of origin issued by chambers of commerce in Mozambique prior to that Territory's accession to independence were not considered by the Committee as sufficient proof of origin, and bearing in mind the position of the new Government of Portugal, as intimated in that Government's note to the Committee dated 14 October 1976 (see para. 79 (p) of the present report and para. 7 of (160) Case No. 173 below).

11. Further to paragraph 5 above, the Committee again included South Africa in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

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

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

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 271st meeting, the expert consultant prepared a summary of the documents submitted by Norway in respect of the tobacco cargo in question. It was pointed out to the Committee in that summary that:

(a) Shipments of 90,470 and 292 boxes of the tobacco cargo were supported by:

(i) Certificates of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi;

(ii) Certificates of origin and arrival at and exportation from the port of Beira issued by the British Consulate, Beira, and

(iii) Bills of lading.

The above documents were taken to be sufficient evidence of the non-Rhodesian origin of those boxes of the tobacco cargo.

(b) Shipments of 81 boxes of the tobacco cargo were supported by:

(i) A certificate of origin issued by the Tobacco Control Commission of Malawi (the certificate nevertheless lacked the Commission's seal);

(ii) A bill of lading.

The above documents, if properly authenticated, were also regarded as sufficient evidence of the non-Southern Rhodesian origin of those boxes of the tobacco cargo.

(c) Shipments of 400 boxes of the tobacco cargo were supported by:

(i) A certificate of export service issued by the Directorate of the Province for Trade Service, Mozambique, and

(ii) Bills of lading.

The above documents were regarded as sufficient evidence of the non-Southern Rhodesian origin of those cases of the tobacco cargo, in accordance with the recommendations in the Secretary-General's notes to all States dated 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971.

(d) Shipments of 18, 46, 59 and 80 boxes of the tobacco cargo were supported only by the manifest of cargo issued by the Scandinavian East Africa Line, and could not be regarded as sufficient evidence of those boxes of the tobacco cargo.

4. The case was discussed at the 275th meeting, at which the Committee examined the documentary evidence submitted by Norway and analysed by the expert consultant. At the same meeting, the Committee decided to accept the origin of the consignment of tobacco supported by the documents issued by the Malawi tobacco authorities and by the British Council at Beira. With regard to the other consignments supported only by a manifest of cargo issued by the Scandinavian East Africa Line, the Committee decided that further inquiries should be made of Norway asking if any other, more acceptable documents could be obtained and forwarded.

5. At the time of preparation of the present report action on the Committee's decision was under way.

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

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

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

3. At the 265th meeting on 5 April 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement concerning the case in which he informed the Committee that the United Kingdom authorities were seeking further information on the

activities of the Belgian company referred to in the note from the Belgian Government dated 12 December 1975, included in the eighth report (S/11927/Rev.1, annex II, (89) Case No. 207, para. 6) concerning the possible import of Southern Rhodesian tobacco by that company. He hoped to be able to give the Committee further information quite soon.

4. The case was discussed at the 271st meeting on 3 June 1976, at which the representative of the United Kingdom made a further statement concerning the reply from Belgium. He said that the reply by the Belgian Government claimed that the information supplied by the United Kingdom note as to the date of the alleged visit to Salisbury was too imprecise for it to be able to investigate. He could not give more precise information on that point, but thought that the information already given was sufficiently precise for an investigation to be pursued. In addition, he informed the Committee that previous United Kingdom notes concerning Belgian tobacco imports seemed to have evoked similar replies from the Belgian Government and, as a result, his Government was preparing a complete record of all suspected cases involving Southern Rhodesian tobacco, which he hoped would be ready soon.

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the same meeting, a note dated 19 July 1976 was sent to Belgium, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"At its 271st meeting the Committee considered the above-mentioned case and it had before it His Excellency's reply on the matter dated 12 December 1975. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the reply thus received. It felt, however, that the original information contained in the United Kingdom note was sufficiently precise to facilitate a more thorough investigation by the Belgian authorities. The Committee hoped, for instance, that the Belgian authorities would have been able to approach Mr. Van Onacker, a partner in the G. Van Onacker and Zoon company, and obtained assurance from him that he had not attended the Rhodesian tobacco sales in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, during March/April 1975, or that the company was not engaged in importing Southern Rhodesian tobacco.

"The Committee expressed the hope that the Belgian authorities might yet be able to extend their investigations along the lines indicated above and communicate to it at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month, their findings and any other relevant information on the matter that may come to light."

6. A first reminder was sent to Belgium on 24 September 1976.

7. A reply dated 27 September 1976 addressed to the Secretary-General was received from the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note of 19 July 1976 relating to the case of the Belgian company Van Onacker and Zoon.

"In accordance with the wishes expressed in the above-mentioned note, the Belgian authorities had conversations with the partners of the company in question.

"In addition, this step was accompanied by inquiries made of the customs service.

"The investigation carried out has revealed that the United Kingdom charges are based on incomplete information and are inaccurate in substance.

"It has become apparent that Mr. Van Onacker did in fact visit Rhodesia in April 1975, and this serves to supplement the somewhat vague information furnished by the United Kingdom on this point.

"However, the investigation conducted by the Belgian authorities uncovered no irregularities with regard to the Belgian regulations on imports from Rhodesia.

"The Belgian authorities have determined to their satisfaction that:

Mr. Van Onacker's visit to Salisbury in April 1975 was not in fact related to the sale of Rhodesian tobacco;

The party in question does not import Rhodesian tobacco;

Mr. Van Onacker has never been an agent of the Africa Leaf Tobacco Company.

"Sharing your concern to ensure the smooth functioning of the work of the Committee on Sanctions, the Belgian authorities remain ready at all times to conduct any necessary inquiries provided that requests relating to such inquiries are formulated with the greatest possible accuracy."

(95) Case No. 262. Tobacco - "Pereira d'Eca": United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1976

1. By a note dated 26 April 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of tobacco aboard the above-named vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

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

"The information is to the effect that a Portuguese registered vessel, the MV Pereira d'Eca, was at the port of Beira in the latter half of November 1975, where she loaded a consignment of some 2,300 cases of tobacco weighing approximately 450 tonnes, supplied by Tradimpex (Pvt) Ltd and Agrisales (Pvt) Ltd, both of Salisbury in Southern Rhodesia. The vessel, which belongs to the Companhia Portuguesa de Transportes Maritimos Sarl (CPTM) of 132, Avenida 24 de Julho, Lisbon, Portugal, left Beira on 1 December 1975 and subsequently put in at the port of Lisbon on 17 December, where the tobacco was delivered to a tabaqueira.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Portugal to assist them with their investigation into the possibility that a tabaqueira may be trading with Southern Rhodesia and that tobacco carried in a Portuguese registered vessel may be of Southern Rhodesian origin. Should the importer or the shipping company claim that the tobacco was not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to his notes PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 about documentary proof of origin, and to ask the Government of Portugal to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the tobacco was of non-Rhodesian origin.

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 14 May 1976 was sent to Portugal, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. First, second and third reminders were sent to Portugal on 14 July, 19 August and 21 September 1976, respectively.
4. In the absence of a reply from Portugal within the prescribed period of two months, the Committee included that Government in the eleventh quarterly list which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

(96) Case No. 281. Trade in tobacco from Southern Rhodesia via Switzerland:
United Kingdom note dated 1 September 1976

1. By a note dated 1 September 1976, the United Kingdom reported information concerning trade in tobacco from Southern Rhodesia by a number of countries through the co-ordination of three Swiss companies. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information, of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation, that a number of countries are trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that Michelle Enterprises (PVT), Ltd. of Salisbury, a Rhodesian trading agency controlled by Mr. Brian Comrie, who is well known to the United Kingdom Government for his sanctions-breaking activities, has been conducting regular trade with State training organisations in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic. The information indicates that Michelle Enterprises exports tobacco and other agricultural commodities from Rhodesia and in turn imports chemicals, metals and agricultural requirements from Eastern Europe. The tobacco is frequently in the form of well known international brands of cigarettes such as Benson and Hedges, Pall Mall, Lucky Strike, State Express or Chesterfields, manufactured in Rhodesia but purporting to come from the United Kingdom or the United States and supported by forged certificates of origin.

"The trade is reputedly conducted via three Swiss companies, Comaisa SA, Tobatrade SA and Centrex SA, all based in Geneva. Comaisa and Tobatrade are known to be closely associated and the information suggests that these companies exist solely to provide a seemingly legitimate cover for a major sanctions-breaking operation.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of the Governments of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that agencies under their direct control may be trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee may further wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Switzerland with the request that they take such action as may be necessary to prohibit the establishment, purchase or operation of companies in Switzerland for the purpose of circumventing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to alert all Member States to the probability that Comaisa SA, Tobatrade SA and Centrex SA are all operated on behalf of Rhodesian interests and to request that, in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), they take all possible measures to prevent firms and individuals in their territories from trading with or through these companies."

2. The proposed action in the United Kingdom note was discussed at the 278th, 279th and 280th meetings of the Committee. At the 278th meeting, the representatives of Romania and the USSR made statements in connexion with the points raised in the United Kingdom note. Their statements were summarized in the Committee's records as follows:

(a) The representative of Romania said that his Government had been most surprised at the contents of the note. Everyone was aware of his country's firm and unequivocal position regarding the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia. Romania had worked energetically for the adoption by the United Nations of effective measures against the régime, it recognized and respected the inalienable rights of the people of Zimbabwe, and it had supported the decision taken at the beginning of 1976 by the Security Council to extend the economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Romania, its people and its foreign trade enterprises had no commercial or other relations with Southern Rhodesia or with Southern Rhodesian individuals or bodies corporate. Romania scrupulously applied the mandatory sanctions decided upon by the Security Council and was therefore astonished that the United Kingdom should give credence to groundless rumours which were designed to cast doubt on his Government's policy towards Southern Rhodesia. It was common knowledge that some industrialized countries were not fulfilling their obligations in applying sanctions and were thus enabling Southern Rhodesia to continue its commercial activities. The accusations against Romania represented an attempt to divert attention from the real problems and to make everyone forget who were the protectors

of the racist minority régime in Salisbury. The Romanian authorities had, as soon as they had learned of the contents of the United Kingdom note, categorically rejected the allegations in question. His delegation, therefore, felt that the regrettable incident should be considered closed.

He also said that the statement he had just made constituted his Government's official reply to the allegations contained in the United Kingdom note. As for the allegations regarding commercial relations between Swiss companies and Southern Rhodesia, his Government had no information on the subject. If the United Kingdom Government had such information it could draft a new note for the purpose of calling the Committee's attention to the commercial relations between Switzerland and Southern Rhodesia. If in reply to that note Switzerland should mention Romania, Romania would at that stage make its reply known. So far the United Kingdom Government had only raised one question - the question of relations between Switzerland and Southern Rhodesia - and Romania did not consider that it was involved in that case.

(b) The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that his delegation, too, had objections to the contents of the note. The position of the USSR on the question of sanctions against the racist régime of Southern Rhodesia was well known. It had been explained many times in the Committee and in other United Nations bodies. The contents of the United Kingdom note had astonished the Soviet side. The United Kingdom delegation in the Committee was very active in the matter of sanctions, but was unfortunately taking a selective approach. In his view, the arguments put forward by the representative of Romania, whose country was mentioned in the note, constituted a complete reply in that regard.

His delegation wished to state the following with regard to the case mentioned in the United Kingdom note. The Soviet foreign trade organizations had no knowledge of the Rhodesian agency mentioned in the note from the United Kingdom Government. They had no relations with that agency, either direct or through intermediaries. The same was true of the Swiss companies Tobatrade and Centrex. The Soviet foreign trade organizations had concluded small contracts with the company Comaisa. They had sold it tea, destined for the United Kingdom, in exchange for articles of general consumption. No contract had been concluded with the Comaisa company for the sale of chemical products and metals or for the purchase of tobacco, agricultural products and cigarettes. The Soviet foreign trade organizations had no information on the business transacted by that company with Southern Rhodesia. In those circumstances, his delegation considered it inappropriate to send the British note to the Soviet Government. The exhaustive reply furnished by the Soviet side should satisfy every impartial member of the Committee, and the question should be considered settled as far as his country was concerned."

3. At the 280th meeting it was decided that in view of the substantive statements made on the matter by the representatives of Romania and the USSR, the United Kingdom note would not be sent to those two Governments. The names of the two Governments would then be deleted from the fourth paragraph of the United Kingdom note, which would thereafter be transmitted to the other Governments proposed therein, under the no-objection procedure, with an appropriate reference in the United Kingdom note as amended, indicating the Committee's decision. The Committee also decided that the procedure just adopted should be regarded only as a special incident and should not create a precedent.

4. At the time of preparation of the present report, the text of the transmittal note of the United Kingdom note, as amended, in accordance with the Committee's decision, and further action on the case were still under consideration by the Committee.

D. CEREALS c/

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

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

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.
4. For other information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.
5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

c/ See also (69) Case No. 140 above.

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

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

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the fourth report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.
4. For further information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

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

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

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

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Venezuela, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.
4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Venezuela, announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this and another case in connexion with which replies were still pending after two reminders.
5. On 17 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Venezuela and discussed the above-mentioned cases. For an account of the meeting see the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I, above.
6. Subsequently, a reply dated 12 October 1976, addressed to the Chairman, also covering Case No. 125 and enclosing relevant attachments concerning that case, was received from the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the United Nations. The substantive parts of that reply and the enclosures are reproduced below:

Note dated 12 October 1976 from Venezuela

I refer once again to your communication of 13 August 1976, concerning cases Nos. 124 and 125 (1968).

In view of our country's great interest in this matter, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela was requested to clarify the situation regarding the case to which you referred, and has now sent us the reply which we take the liberty of attaching to this letter.

I reaffirm our constant concern to comply fully with the decisions of the United Nations and the Venezuelan Government's interest in clarifying all aspects of this matter.

Enclosures

Letter dated 31 August 1976 from the President of the
Corporación de Mercadeo Agrícola, Caracas, to the
Director-General of the Ministry of Foreign Relations

"I take this opportunity to reply to your communication No. P I - OM 16264 of 4 August 1976 requesting information on the import from Southern Rhodesia of maize shipped on the SS Alexandros a vessel of Greek registry owned by the Compañía Armenia de Navegación SA of Panama.

"It is my duty to inform you in that connexion that the imports of the Corporación de Mercadeo Agrícola in 1971 included no shipments from Southern Rhodesia. As the attached table indicates, the white variety of maize was purchased in Mexico, Angola and Mozambique, and the yellow variety was imported from the Argentine Republic and the United States of America."

7. The relevant portion of the attached table showed Angola and Mozambique, and specifically excluding South Africa, to be the origin of 10,500 metric tons of the white maize, worthy 3,378,375 bolivars, imported by Venezuela under a contract concluded in 1971.

8. A reply dated 19 November 1976 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 attach hereto, for the information of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), a copy of the official translation of the minutes and decision of the Magistrates' Court, Chios, Greece, at its meeting of 20 May 1976, regarding the case of the vessel Armonia (Case No. 124).

"As it is stated in the records, the Magistrates' Court of Chios acquitted Mr. Christoforos Tsakoumakis, then Master of the said vessel, of the charge that he knowingly carried on that ship a cargo of corn destined to Port Carello of Venezuela, of South Rhodesian origin."

9. According to the document submitted by Greece the court had based its judgement on the ground that no evidence could be adduced by the prosecution to refute the contention by the defendant, supported by certain documentary proof, that the shipment of maize in question was from Mozambique; the recommended bolletín de registro could not be produced in court by the defendant since, according to the testimony obtained from the Greek Consulate in Beira, such a document was granted "exclusively and solely to importers and exporters established in Mozambique and declared members in the Chambers of Commerce" of that State.

10. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37, in annex III, below.

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

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

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

3. In the absence of a reply from Venezuela the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.

4. For further information on this case, concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama and Venezuela see paragraphs 3-6 and 10 of (108) Case No. 124, above.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth, tenth and eleventh quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April, 13 August and 15 December 1976, respectively.

E. COTTON AND COTTON SEED

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

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

F. MEAT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

See annex IV.

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

See annex IV.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fourth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Gabon, announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.
4. On 19 August 1976 the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Gabon and discussed the case with him. An account of the meeting is contained in the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I to the present report.
5. Subsequently, a reply dated 25 September 1976 was received from Gabon, also covering Case Nos. 154, 232 and INGO-9, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 16 (i) of (238) Case No. 154 below.

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 271st meeting on 3 June 1976, the Committee discussed the case and decided to consider it closed.

G. SUGAR

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.

4. For further information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth lists which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.
4. For additional information regarding the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.

4. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Liberia in the eleventh quarterly list which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

(137) Case No. 147. Sugar - "Anangel Ambition": United Kingdom note dated 27 June 1973

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

H. FERTILIZERS AND AMMONIA

(138) Case No. 2. Import of manufactured fertilizers from Europe: United Kingdom note dated 14 January 1969

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

(139) Case No. 48. Ammonia - "Butaneuve": United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969

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

(140) Case No. 52. Bulk ammonia: United Kingdom notes dated 15 October and 10 November 1969

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

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

3. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Portugal announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.

4. On 21 September 1976 the Chairman met with the Chargé d'affaires of Portugal, and later with the Foreign Minister of Portugal, and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meeting, see the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.

5. Subsequently, a comprehensive communication dated 14 October 1976 was received from Portugal in which reference was made to this and the other cases mentioned in the Chairman's note to Portugal of 13 August 1976, as well as to Case No. 173. For the relevant portion of the communication, see paragraph 7 of (160) Case No. 173 below.

(141) Case No. 66. Ammonia - "Cérons": United Kingdom note dated 7 January 1970

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

(142) Case No. 69. Ammonia - "Mariotte": United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970

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

(143) Case No. 101. Anhydrous ammonia: United States note dated 12 October 1970

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

(144) Case No. 113. Anhydrous ammonia - "Cypress" and "Isforn": United Kingdom note dated 29 January 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 2 January 1976 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"1. The board of directors of Chemie Linz, AG (in 1969 registered under its former trade name Oesterreichische Stickstoffwerke, AG) - the latter having held 10 per cent of the stocks of Nitrex AG in 1969 - has no knowledge of any shipment via Mozambique of manufactured fertilizers (ammonia anhydride) to Southern Rhodesia in 1969 as mentioned in the Secretary-General's note.

"2. In its capacity as a constituent company of Nitrex AG, Chemie Linz AG is, however, aware of the fact that - in accordance with an agreement among Nitrex AG partners - ammonia anhydride being a 'technical nitrogen product', this was not one of the products it was authorized to sell. Only very small quantities of ammonia anhydride needed for direct application as fertilizer are not covered by this restriction; but not even sales of such small quantities appear in the Nitrex AG sales statistics of 1969.

"Chemie Linz AG explicitly states that at no time of its association with Nitrex AG did it sell ammonia anhydride through this latter Swiss company.

"3. Chemie Linz AG confirms that Dr. Wilhelm Andreas Hawlik, Friedrich Hiller and Alfred Seelinger were members of the Nitrex AG board of

directors. The cancellation of their former contracts with Chemie Linz AG (then Oesterreichische Stickstoffwerke AG), however, was a precondition for assuming functions in the Swiss company, whose board of directors had to act in the interest of all constituent companies, i.e., all European nitrogen producers holding stocks of Nitrex AG.

"The labour contracts of Messrs. Hawlik, Hiller and Seelinger were cancelled on 30 June 1962, 31 December 1962 and 31 October 1962, respectively. Therefore, Chemie Linz AG (Oesterreichische Stickstoffwerke AG) had no opportunity to influence Nitrex AG business activities through the aforementioned three managers. Furthermore, Chemie Linz AG had and still has no opportunity of exerting any influence on the board of governors' business activities because it is not represented thereon.

"The exercise of rights derived from the membership of Chemie Linz AG in Nitrex AG has always been possible only through a consensus of all 10 constituent companies. In this respect Chemie Linz AG due to its stock holdings of only 5 per cent of the above Swiss company, is in a comparatively weak position.

"4. Finally, Chemie Linz AG points out that it has no knowledge of any sales contracts concerning shipment of chemical products to buyers in Southern Rhodesia or delivery to such buyers concluded between Nitrex AG and South African buyer firms since the adoption of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

4. Second reminders were sent to France, Italy and Norway on 26 January 1976, and a reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on the same day inquiring if the investigations undertaken by the authorities were completed and the results could be communicated to the Committee.

5. Replies were received from Italy, France, Norway and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 11 February 1976 from Italy

"The Permanent Mission of Italy to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform that following information provided by the Security Council Committee, the competent Italian authorities have enquired as to the position and role of Mr. Giuseppe Viani within the Nitrex AG Corporation of Zurich, Switzerland, in connexion with His Excellency's note of 29 September 1975. It has thus been ascertained that Mr. Viani is not a member of the Board of said company. Mr. Viani has no managing functions: he is a technical expert with no policy-making influence."

(ii) Note dated 24 February 1976 from France

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and has the honour to inform him that the information contained in his note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) concerning case No. 113 has been brought to the attention of the French Government. The Government has stated that notwithstanding its desire to prevent any violation of sanctions, it could not be held responsible for the activities of its nationals abroad.

Only if the company Nitrex AG, registered in Zurich, was linked with companies established in France through the French national on the board of directors referred to in the note could the French Government intervene. If such were the case, the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations would be grateful if the Secretary-General would be good enough to provide it with precise information regarding the names, activities and headquarters of such companies. The Permanent Mission would then ensure that the necessary measures were taken to terminate all activities of such companies which were in contravention of the provisions of resolution 253."

(iii) Note dated 26 February 1976 from Norway

"According to information made available to the Norwegian authorities, the firm involved - Nitrex AG, registered in Zurich, Switzerland - is an export organization for various European fertilizer manufacturers, including the Norwegian firm Norsk Hydro A/S. Nitrex AG maintained normal commercial relations with Southern Rhodesia prior to Security Council resolution 253 of 29 May 1968. These commercial relations were discontinued as a result of the Security Council decision. However, one shipment of fertilizers, the contract for which had been agreed upon prior to 29 May 1968, was delivered to one of the ports in Mozambique after that date. The shipment originated from a State which was not a member of the United Nations. Since this shipment was delivered, Nitrex AG has not made any sales to Southern Rhodesia.

"The Norwegian company concerned (Norsk Hydro A/S) has informed the Norwegian authorities that it was not involved in this transaction and had no possibility of influencing Nitrex AG. The Norwegian firm (Norsk Hydro A/S) owns approximately 1/9 of the share capital in Nitrex AG, and its influence is therefore restricted to the shareholders' meeting. As regards shipments to neighbouring countries of Southern Rhodesia, Norsk Hydro A/S states that standard contract forms aimed at preventing re-exportation to Southern Rhodesia are used by Nitrex AG.

"Mr. Jacques Labourée acquired Norwegian citizenship in 1956. Mr. Labourée left Norsk Hydro A/S in 1967 and was, on a personal basis, named Director at Nitrex AG on 1 January 1968, with special responsibilities for administration and economic affairs. Mr. Labourée worked for Nitrex AG until 14 February 1973, and was at no stage involved in sales activities.

(iv) Note dated 8 March 1976 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"After careful and time-consuming preparation, synchronized external trade audits were conducted at the firms BASF and Farbwerke Hoechst AG. According to the audit reports, no evidence was found of violations on the part of these two firms of the provisions of the Rhodesia embargo.

"The suggestion of the Sanctions Committee that the Federal Government request Messrs. Josef Schoepfner and Eugen Schrief to bring their influence to bear on the Swiss firm Nitrex AG, Zurich, with a view to its compliance with the sanctions provisions, was endorsed by the Interministerial Committee on Southern Rhodesia as early as January 1976, pending submission of the audit reports. These have now shown Mr. Schoepfner to be an executive of Nitrex AG. Mr. Schrief, however, is said to have worked in the accounting department of Nitrex AG but to have meanwhile ended his affiliation with this corporation.

"The possibility to approach Mr. Schoepfner is at present being explored in the light of the Foreign Trade Ordinance of the Federal Republic of Germany.

"Additional information, when received, will promptly be communicated to the Secretary-General."

6. A note dated 16 November 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany inquiring whether the additional information promised with regard to the question of Mr. Schoepfner's membership of the executive board of directors of Nitrex AG was available and could be forwarded to the Committee.

(145) Case No. 123. Anhydrous ammonia - "Zion": United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.
4. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Panama, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 in annex III below.

(146) Case No. 129. Anhydrous ammonia - "Kristian Birkeland": United Kingdom note dated 24 February 1972

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

(147) Case No. 204. Import of agricultural crop chemicals by Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 13 March 1975

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

I. MACHINERY

(148) Case No. 50. Tractor kits: United Kingdom note dated 2 October 1969

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

(149) Case No. 58. Book-keeping and accounting machines: Italian note dated 6 November 1969

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

(150) Case No. 170. Spare parts for sewing or knitting machines - "Elbeland"

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 271st meeting, a note dated 13 July 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany referring to that Government's replies of 10 January and 6 October 1975 and inquiring about the final outcome of the proceedings against the other two firms concerned as well as the details of their names, addresses and the penalties imposed upon them.
4. A first reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 6 October 1976.
5. A reply dated 12 October 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations ... has the honour to communicate the following.

"Non-appealable fines of several thousands of Deutschemarks have been imposed on the firm of Johann M. Rockelmann KG, Eschwege, which was one of the other firms involved in Case No. 170 and had exported spare parts and accessories for the textile industry to Southern Rhodesia in violation of the embargo provisions of the Foreign Trade Ordinance of the Federal Republic of Germany.

"The proceedings against the other firm have not yet been concluded."

(151) Case No. 189. Wankie power station: United Kingdom note dated 9 September 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the seventh report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. The case was discussed at the 269th meeting on 13 May 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(152) Case No. 209. Rolling mill rolls: United Kingdom note dated 6 June 1975

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's procedure, at the 269th meeting a note dated 9 June 1976 was sent to Austria, under the no-objection procedure, requesting that Government to seek further information from the Austrian firm as to what had actually happened to the rolling mill rolls in question, their exact destination and if they had been installed in the country of destination by an expert from the Austrian firm.

4. A reply dated 23 July 1976 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Austrian authorities requested the Austrian firm Eisenwerk Sulzau-Werfen to provide the additional information required by the Committee. The company stated that it has no clue as to the final destination of the rolling mill rolls dispatched by it to the South African firm Non-Ferrous Distributors, c/o Rennie's Consolidated (Pty), Ltd., Port Elizabeth, Republic of South Africa. The South African company had, furthermore, not requested experts of the Austrian firm for proper installation of the machinery nor for any other technical services in connexion with the transaction."

5. The case was discussed again at the 280th meeting on 18 November 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(153) Case No. 221. Supply of electrical equipment: United Kingdom note dated 1 September 1975

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

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

3. A second reminder was sent to Belgium on 11 March 1976.

4. A reply dated 2 April 1976 was received from Belgium, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note No. PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) concerning Case No. 221, to which was attached a note from the Government of the United Kingdom informing the Committee that that Government had received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation which suggested that a Belgian company was trading with Southern Rhodesia. According to that information, a Belgian company, Electrothermil Philips-ACEC SA of Herstal, is supplying, on a regular basis, items of electrical equipment, including transformers and capacitors, to a Southern Rhodesian company, Morewear Industries (Rhod) (PVT), Ltd., Salisbury.

"The competent Belgian authorities, in particular the Customs and Excise Department, after making a thorough investigation, have been unable to discover any irregularity in the operations of the above-mentioned firm.

"In carrying out that investigation, the Belgian Customs and Excise Department had no information which would have enabled it to follow a specific line of inquiry.

"As I have already had the honour to inform you, in particular in connexion with Case No. 207, the Belgian Government, when a question is submitted to it by the Committee on sanctions, would, as a general rule, like to receive the most precise information possible from the Committee in order to be able to conduct the necessary inquiries profitably.

"In the case in question, the United Kingdom, which states that it is in possession of 'information of sufficient reliability to merit further

investigation', has not communicated that information to the Committee or, a fortiori, to my Government.

"The Belgian Government would therefore like to be provided with all the information which the United Kingdom no doubt has, if it is able to assert that a Belgian firm is supplying a Rhodesian firm with electrical equipment and to specify that the deliveries are made on a regular basis and involve transformers and capacitors.

"Any information regarding the identity of the cargo vessel or vessels concerned and the dates of the deliveries made, which no doubt form part of the 'information of sufficient reliability' reportedly received by the Government of the United Kingdom, would be needed by the Belgian Customs and Excise Department in order to conduct further inquiries.

"My Government is therefore keeping the matter under consideration pending the receipt by the Committee on sanctions of further information from the British authorities."

5. The matter was discussed at the 281st meeting, at which the representative of the United Kingdom made the following statement:

"I would like to refer the Committee's attention to Case No. 221, and in particular to the reply of the Belgian Government dated 21 April 1976, in which they asked by Government to supply further information on the possible supply of electrical equipment to Southern Rhodesia by the Belgian firm of Electrothermil Phillips - ACEC, SA.

"The Committee will be well aware of the problem my Government has in reconciling the confidentiality of its sources with the provision of full information to the Committee. In this case, the only further information that we are in a position to provide is that an oscillator pot was flown to Frankfurt from Johannesburg and then transported to Belgium on or around the third week of September 1975, and a replacement part sent through Johannesburg to Moreware Industries (Pty), Ltd., of Salisbury. Other assorted items of electrical equipment were supplied between April and November 1975.

"I suggest that the Committee may wish to pass this information on to the Belgian Government with the request that further investigations should now be undertaken."

6. At the same meeting the Committee decided that the information contained in the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom should be passed on to the Belgian authorities with a request that further investigations should now be undertaken.

7. At the time of preparation of the present report action on the Committee's decision was under way.

(154) Case No. 238. Replacement equipment for steel processing plants in Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 6 January 1976

1. By a note dated 6 January 1976, the United Kingdom reported information concerning replacement equipment for steel processing plants in Southern Rhodesia. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information, of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation, that an Austrian company is trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that an Austrian firm, Vereinigte Edelstahlwerke Aktiengesellschaft, has supplied replacement equipment for two steel processing plants situated at Que Que in Southern Rhodesia, which were damaged by an explosion in mid-April 1975, and that it will take all the steel there processed, in payment, until the debt is cleared. It is understood that the firm in question is a new company, formed from the recent merger between Schoeller-Bleikman and Boehlerand and Steinische Gusstahlwerke.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Austria in order to assist them with their inquiries into the possibility that the Vereinigte Edelstahlwerke Aktiengesellschaft is trading with Southern Rhodesia."

2. At the Committee's request, following informal consultation, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 January 1976 to Austria transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 12 March 1976 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"On the basis of the information contained in the note of 6 January, addressed to the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) by the Government of the United Kingdom, the Austrian authorities carried out a thorough investigation of the alleged trading by the Austrian company Vereinigte Edelstahlwerke AG with Southern Rhodesia.

"These inquiries have led to the conclusion that neither Vereinigte Edelstahlwerke AG nor its predecessors did, either directly or via a third country, supply any replacement equipment to Southern Rhodesia, as is indicated in the above-mentioned note. Similarly, no evidence for agreements concerning payment for such supplies, in any form, could be found."

4. The case was discussed at the 276th meeting on 22 July 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(155) Case No. 256. Supply of machine parts to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 April 1976

1. By a note dated 21 April 1976, the United Kingdom reported information concerning the supply of machine parts to Southern Rhodesia. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of a sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a Spanish firm has been trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that Rodamientos Medinabi of Madrid have supplied, and continue to supply, plain, ball and roller bearings to Rhodesia Bearings (Pvt) Ltd, 48 Pioneer Street, Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia."

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the Government of Spain in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Rodamientos Medinabi are trading with Southern Rhodesia. The Secretary-General may further wish to suggest to the Government of Spain that an investigation of the files and accounts of Rodamientos Medinabi may prove useful in view of the apparently regular nature of this trade."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 10 May 1976 was sent to Spain, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. A first reminder was sent to Spain on 14 July 1976.
4. A reply dated 20 July 1976 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations ... in connexion with [the Secretary-General's] note of 14 July 1976 (Case No. 256) is pleased to inform him, with reference to the information reported by the Government of the United Kingdom concerning the supposed supply of plain, ball and roller bearings by the Spanish firm, Rodamientos Medinabi of Madrid to Rhodesia Bearings (Pvt) Ltd., that, the relevant inquiries having been made, he can confirm that the above-mentioned Medinabi firm maintains no regular business with Rhodesia, nor has it exported any of its products to the Rhodesian firm in question.

"Furthermore, he wishes to point out that the General Directorate of Exports of the Spanish Ministry of Trade systematically refuses any request in the case of which Rhodesia is the country of destination.

"Nevertheless, all possible measures have been taken to prevent any Spanish exports from reaching, even indirectly, Rhodesia."

(156) Case No. 267. Industrial sewing machines from Japan: United Kingdom note dated 17 May 1976

1. By a note dated 17 May 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning the export of industrial sewing machines from Japan. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a Japanese firm has been trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that on 8 November 1975 the MV Straat Hong Kong was at the port of Kobe in Japan, where she loaded an industrial sewing machine supplied by Elize Incorporated of Osaka. The vessel, which is owned by the Netherlands firm Koninklijke Java-China-Paketaart Lijnen, BV (Royal Interocean Lines), Het Scheepvaarthuis, Prins Hendrikkade 108-114, Postbus 248, Amsterdam, subsequently put in at Cape Town where the machine was unloaded for delivery to Rhodesian Industrial Sales, Ltd., of Bulawayo in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Japan in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Elize Incorporated are trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that goods carried in a vessel owned and registered in the Netherlands were destined for Southern Rhodesia."

2. In accordance with the Committee's practice under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 8 June 1976 were sent to Japan and the Netherlands transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. A reply dated 21 July 1976 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"An investigation by the Netherlands authorities has established that the MV Straat Hong Kong did in fact on 8 November 1975 take on board at Kobe, Japan, an industrial sewing machine supplied by Elize Incorporated of Osaka. It was also established that this machine was delivered at Cape Town. The particulars pertaining to this shipment, known to the shippers and contained in the ship's manifest, do not give any indication from which a final destination in Southern Rhodesia could be deduced."

4. A first reminder was sent to Japan on 12 August 1976.

5. A reply dated 7 September 1976 was received from Japan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General of the findings by the Government of Japan, as follows:

"(a) An industrial sewing machine was shipped with the status of an export not involving foreign exchange from the port of Kobe aboard the MV Straat Hong Kong on 19 November 1975.

"(b) The said machine had been previously exported by Elize Incorporated, and subsequently shipped back to Japan for necessary repairs.

"It was shipped out again on the above-mentioned day after repairs had been completed.

"(c) The said machine was unloaded at Port Elizabeth in South Africa to be delivered back, through Mr. Michael David (P.O. Box 1115, Port Elizabeth), to Industrial Sales Agencies, Ltd. (P.O. Box 496, Francistown, Botswana).

"(2) It may be noticed from the above that the Japanese Government's findings differ as follows from those of the Government of the United Kingdom set out in the latter's note of 17 May 1976 addressed to the Committee:

"(a) The date of shipment from the port of Kobe was 19 November 1975 instead of 8 November 1975.

"(b) The port of unloading was Port Elizabeth instead of Cape Town.

"(c) The machine in question was for delivery to Industrial Sales Agencies, Ltd., of Francistown in Botswana instead of Rhodesian Industrial Sales, Ltd., of Bulawayo in Southern Rhodesia."

6. The case was discussed at the 278th meeting, at which the representative of Japan undertook to study the matter again and report back to the Committee at a future meeting, with particular reference to the point arising from his Government's reply concerning the final destination of the machine in question and the identity of the consignee. The Committee also decided that the Government of Botswana should be requested to confirm whether the sewing machine had indeed arrived in that country, whether it was still there and whether it was the same machine that had been returned from repairs in Japan; its serial number could be checked for that purpose.

7. At the 280th meeting the representative of Japan submitted a correction of a factual error contained in his Government's reply indicated above. According to that correction, paragraphs 1 (c) and 2 (c) of the Japanese reply should be replaced as follows:

New paragraph 1 (c)

"The said machine, the orderer for repair of which was Industrial Sales Agencies, Ltd., in Francistown, Botswana, was unloaded at Port Elizabeth in South Africa to be delivered back to Michael David in Port Elizabeth, South Africa."

New paragraph 2 (c)

"The machine in question was for delivery to Michael David in Port Elizabeth, South Africa, instead of Rhodesian Industrial Sales, Ltd., of Bulawayo, Southern Rhodesia."

The representative of Japan also indicated that his Government, rather than that of Botswana, would be in a position to provide the serial number of the machine, if still necessary.

8. At the same meeting the Committee decided that, in view of the correction just made by the representative of Japan, it was no longer necessary to send the note of inquiry to Botswana, as previously decided. Consideration of the matter was postponed until the Committee had had time to study the reply from Japan again, as amended.

J. TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT

Motor vehicles and/or motor-vehicle spares

(157) Case No. 9. Motor vehicles: United States note dated 28 March 1969

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

(158) Case No. 145. Trucks, engines etc.: information obtained from published sources

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

(159) Case No. 168. Motor vehicles or spare parts - "Straat Rio": United Kingdom note dated 15 March 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 Zambia, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.

4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Zambia, announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.

5. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Zambia, see paragraphs 5, 6 and 8 of (90) Case No. 156 above.

(160) Case No. 173. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "Daphne": United Kingdom note dated 16 May 1974

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

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

3. At the 267th, 269th and 270th meetings the Committee considered the figures relating to the number of motor-vehicles shipped from Japan, as reported in the eighth report (see S/11927/Rev.1, vol. I, annex II, (153) Case No. 173, para. 10). A further analysis of those figures indicated that the number of motor-vehicles derived from the documents submitted by Sweden (398) included those exported by Nissan Motor Co., Ltd. (99), C. Itch and Co., Ltd. (67) and Mitsubishi Motor Corporation (49), leaving 183 motor-vehicles exported by Toyota Motor Sales Co., Ltd. The representative of Japan pointed out and the representative of the United Kingdom, the source of the original information, confirmed, that the case was based only on the motor-vehicles exported by the Toyota firm which were suspected to have been destined for Southern Rhodesia. It was agreed at the 270th meeting, therefore, that there was basically no discrepancy between the figures submitted by Japan and those derived from the Swedish documents, except for two motor-vehicles, which could possibly be accounted for as the two automobiles reported by Portugal as having been forwarded to a consignee in Southern Rhodesia from Beira, Mozambique (see paras. 4 and 7 below).

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 267th meeting, a note dated 21 August 1976 was sent to Portugal, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"At its 267th meeting, the Committee considered Case No. 173 concerning the shipment of motor vehicles and motor-vehicle spare parts from Japan to various countries in central and southern Africa aboard the vessel Daphne. It had before it a reply from His Excellency's Government dated 8 May 1975, in which it was indicated, among other things, that two of the automobiles unloaded at the port of Beira had been forwarded to the Southern Rhodesian firm of Mobil Motors (Pty), Ltd., Salisbury, by a local firm in Beira known as Mitchell Cotts.

"The Committee expressed its appreciation for the co-operation of His Excellency's Government in responding to its inquiries as to the disposition of the motor vehicles and motor-vehicle spare parts in question. The Committee noted, however, that the forwarding of two of the motor vehicles to Southern Rhodesia by a firm in Mozambique, under the jurisdiction of Portugal, was a clear violation of the sanctions established by the Security Council against the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia. The Committee would therefore welcome information as to the circumstances in which such a transaction was permitted to occur, as well as information on the measures taken by the authorities in Mozambique both in regard to the particular violation in question and to ensure that such transactions did not recur.

"The Committee also indicated that it would appreciate receiving a reply from His Excellency's Government at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

5. First, second and third reminders were sent to Portugal on 22 July, 24 August and 24 September 1976, respectively.

6. A comprehensive communication dated 14 October 1976 was received from Portugal. That communication included a reference to Case No. 173 as well as to Case Nos. 52,

213, 227 and INGO-4, which were the subject of the Chairman's personal contact with the Chargé d'affaires and with the Foreign Minister of Portugal. d/

7. The reference in the communication was to the effect that the new Government of Portugal, although well set on the course of doing so, had nevertheless encountered some difficulties, purely legal and administrative, which did not render immediately possible total and effective compliance with the system of sanctions.

"Such was the situation," the communication stated, "as regards Case No. 173, transportation, via Beira, of two automobiles on the ship Daphne, concerning which my Government had the honour to communicate to the Committee, in its letter of 8 May 1975, the information received at the time by the competent Portuguese authorities.

"It is unnecessary to underline that, Mozambique having acceded to independence on 25 June 1975, such incidents shall not again occur under the responsibility of the Portuguese Government. This same circumstance prevents the Portuguese Government from furnishing further information regarding this case, beyond that already transmitted in the letter of 8 May 1975 cited above.

"The Portuguese Government is investigating the other cases to which its attention had been called by the Committee on sanctions and hopes to be able to furnish the relevant information in the shortest possible time."

8. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 278th meeting, a note dated 26 November 1976 was sent, under the no-objection procedure, to Japan and Sweden, the countries of origin and of the shipping company, respectively, pointing out the admission of the Portuguese Government that two of the Toyota motor vehicles had in fact been sent to a consignee in Southern Rhodesia, information that appeared to be at variance with the replies given previously by the two Governments according to which none of the Toyota motor vehicles shipped aboard the MV Daphne on the relevant voyage were destined for Southern Rhodesia.

9. A reply dated 14 December 1976 was received from Japan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations ... has the honour to assure the Secretary-General once again that the Government of Japan has found, on the basis of the thorough investigation of the case, that none of the consignment of vehicles in question was destined for Southern Rhodesia."

(161) Case No. 180. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "Straat Rio":
United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1974

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

d/ See the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.

(162) Case No. 182. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "M. Citadel":
United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 Zambia, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 6 April 1976.
4. At the 267th, 269th and 270th meetings the Committee considered the figures relating to the number of motor vehicles shipped from Japan, as reported in the eighth report (see S/11927/Rev.1, vol. I, annex II, (155) Case No. 182, para. 9). A further analysis of those figures indicated that the number of motor vehicles derived from the documents submitted by Sweden (393) included those exported by Nissau Motor Co., Ltd. (92), C. Itch and Co., Ltd. (9), Mitsubishi Motor Corporation (20) and Daihatsu Motor Sales Co., Ltd. (7), leaving 265 motor vehicles exported by Toyota Motor Sales Co., Ltd. The representative of Japan pointed out and the representative of the United Kingdom, the source of the original information, confirmed, that the case was based only on the motor vehicles exported by the Toyota firm, which were suspected to have been destined for Southern Rhodesia. It was agreed at the 270th meeting, therefore, that there was no discrepancy between the figures submitted by Japan and those derived from the Swedish documents.
5. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included Zambia in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as press release on 13 August 1976.
6. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Zambia, announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.
7. For additional information concerning the action taken on this case with regard to Zambia, see paragraphs 5 to 9 of (90) Case No. 156 above.

(163) Case No. 195. Motor vehicles or motor-vehicle spares - "Soula K":
United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 269th meeting, notes dated 9 June 1976 were sent to Greece inquiring again if the investigations were completed and the results could be communicated to the Committee, and to Panama, requesting further information on the matter, particularly the location of the office of the Panamanian firm concerned.

4. First reminders were sent to Greece and Panama on 16 August 1976.
5. An acknowledgement dated 19 August 1976 was received from Panama.
6. Replies were received from Panama and Greece, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(a) Note dated 9 September 1976 from Panama e/

"In connexion with your notes verbales ... I have the honour to inform you, on behalf of the Panamanian Government, of the following facts that were brought to the attention of this Mission in note DOI-4335 of 25 August 1976, signed by Dr. Carlos Ozores T., Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs:

"(1) The vessel Soula K, which is suspected of having committed violations of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia imposed by Security Council resolution 253 (1968), is not registered in Panama;

"(2) That vessel is registered under the Greek flag;

"(3) Any responsibility for the violations ascribed to the above-mentioned vessel rests with the authorities of the country in which the vessel is registered, which in this case is Greece."

(b) Note dated 11 September 1976 from Greece

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to communicate that the investigation concerning the vessel MTA Soula K, that was carried out by the Piraeus Port Authority, confirmed that the said vessel, which was chartered by a Japanese commercial firm, called at the port of Lourenço Marques on 2 October 1974 and unloaded merchandises of the Japanese company in question. However, the evidence brought before the Investigating Magistrate was not sufficient in order to substantiate that the Captain and other competent personnel on board were in position to have a knowledge of the final destination of the shipment."

7. With regard to the reply from Panama, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that, in several cases involving vessels of Panamanian ownership and in which Panama had replied to the Committee's inquiries, f/ the Government had maintained the position that, under international agreements, vessels of foreign registration, even if owned by Panamanian companies, must for all purposes be regarded as territory of the other country, which then must bear primary responsibility for the activities of those vessels.

8. With regard to the reply from Greece, a further note dated 15 October 1976 was sent to that Government under the no-objection procedure, requesting additional, pertinent information, namely, the name and address of the Japanese commercial firm that had chartered the Greek-registered vessel, Soula K.

9. A reply dated 15 November 1976 was received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

e/ See also subpara. 8 of para. 9 of Case No. USI-41 in annex III below.

f/ See for instance, the fifth annual report (S/10852/Rev.1, annex II, Case Nos. (59) 114, (73) 104, (88) 124, (89) 125, (101) 117, (108) 112 and (115) 132).

"The Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to communicate that the vessel Soula K was chartered from 26 January 1971 to 13 May 1976 by the Japanese firm Mitsui OSK Lines, 1 World Trade Center, Suite 2211, New York, New York 10048, USA."

10. At the time of preparation of the present report the Committee was still considering what further action to take.

(164) Case No. 197. Trade in motor vehicles (and other commodities):
United Kingdom note dated 6 December 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. First and second reminders were sent to Switzerland on 13 January and 11 March 1976.
4. In the absence of a reply from Switzerland within the prescribed period of two months the Committee included that Government in the ninth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 6 April 1976.
5. A third reminder was sent to Switzerland on 13 April 1976.
6. A reply dated 1 June 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... with reference to the Secretary-General's notes of 31 October 1975, 13 January, 11 March and 13 April 1976, has the honour to confirm the content of the Observer's note of 25 July 1975 and to emphasize, in particular, that the presumptions which were the subject of the Observer's note of 22 April 1975 to the Secretary-General have not been confirmed, bearing in mind the explanations subsequently given by the company in question, to which the Observer's above-mentioned note of 25 July 1975 referred.

"The Federal authorities repeat that they are quite prepared to reopen inquiries into the matter should the Sanctions Committee obtain further information about it."

Aircraft and/or aircraft spares

(165) Case No. 41. Aircraft spares: United Kingdom note dated 5 September 1969

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

(166) Case No. 67. Supply of aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 January 1970

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

(167) Case No. 144. Sale of three Boeing aircraft to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

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

(168) Case No. 162. Viscount aircraft: United Kingdom note dated 17 January 1974

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

(169) Case No. 206. Jet fighters and other military equipment: information obtained from published sources

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

(170) Case No. 232. Acquisition of DC-8 aircraft by Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 28 November 1975

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 16 December 1975 was sent to Gabon, transmitting the United Kingdom note (see the eighth report, S/11927/Rev.1, vol. I, annex II, (163) Case No. 232, para. 1) and requesting comments thereon. Similarly, a note dated 18 December 1975 was sent, under the no-objection procedure, to all Member States, transmitting the United Kingdom note and drawing their particular attention to the last two paragraphs thereof.
4. Acknowledgements dated 12 January and 3 February 1976 were received from the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada, respectively, stating that the contents of the Committee's note dated 18 December 1975 had been brought to the attention of the respective Governments.
5. First, second and third reminders were sent to Gabon on 18 February, 7 April and 10 May 1976, respectively.
6. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Gabon, announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case, among others, in connexion with which a reply was still pending after three reminders.
7. On 19 August 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Gabon and discussed the case in question. An account of that meeting is contained in the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.
8. Subsequently, a reply dated 25 September 1976 was received from Gabon, also covering Case Nos. 61, 154 and INGO-9, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 16 (i) of (238) Case No. 154, below.

Others

- (171) Case No. 88. Cycle accessories: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1970

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

- (172) Case No. 141. Locomotives - "Beira": United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1973

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

K. TEXTILE FABRICS AND RELATED PRODUCTS

- (173) Case No. 93. Shirts manufactured in Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970

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

L. SPORTING ACTIVITIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIONS

- (174) Case No. 120. Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games: note from the Federal Republic of Germany dated 5 April 1971

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

- (175) Case No. 148. Southern Rhodesia and the Maccabiah Games: information supplied to the Committee by the Sudan on 21 June 1973

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

- (176) Case No. 166. Southern Rhodesia and the International Judo Federation (IJF): information obtained from published sources

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

- (177) Case No. 167. Tour of Southern Rhodesian cricket player abroad: information obtained from published sources

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

(178) Case No. 174. Hockey team tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. The case was discussed at the 280th meeting on 18 November 1976, at which the Committee decided to consider it as closed.

(179) Case No. 175. Yachting coach on tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. First and second reminders were sent to Belgium on 27 January and 11 March 1976, respectively.
4. A reply dated 2 April 1976 was received from Belgium, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) concerning case No. 175.

"In that note, you were kind enough to inform us that the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia had received information from published sources to the effect that a Spanish national yachting instructor named Paul Maes undertook a visit, at the end of April 1974, to Rhodesia in order to coach Southern Rhodesian teams.

"The competent Belgian authorities have endeavoured to trace Mr. Paul Maes.

"After a long investigation, these authorities came up against the following difficulties:

"1. As the aforementioned note points out, since Mr. Paul Maes does not reside in Belgium but has his centre of operations in Spain, it would not be possible for the Belgian authorities to bring to his attention the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

This is the utmost which my Government could do under the circumstances, since it has no legal means to supervise, and still less to anticipate, the movements of its nationals abroad.

"2. In any event, the first name and last name of the individual in question are so common in Belgium that it has been impossible to pick out from among thousands of Belgians the one who might fit the description given in Your Excellency's note.

"3. Since Belgium has broken off all consular relations with Southern Rhodesia in compliance with the relevant decisions taken by the United Nations, it has no office on the spot which could have been alerted to the activities of this national.

"My Government would be grateful if this information could be brought to the Committee's attention."

(180) Case No. 181. Southern Rhodesia and the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA): information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A letter dated 13 January 1976 addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations g/ was received from the President of the Dominican Olympic Committee. The substantive part of that letter is reproduced below:

"The Dominican Olympic Committee (COD) has received through the Secretariat for Foreign Affairs of the Dominican Republic the communication from the United Nations regarding the international recognition being sought for a sporting association in Southern Rhodesia. h/

"With regard to that matter, we wish to point out that it is not within the competence of the United Nations to submit suggestions of this kind to us, because it is a clearly political body and has no right to interfere in the development of the world sporting movement.

"We feel that any sports problems of Southern Rhodesia are the exclusive concern of world sports organizations and do not require the intervention of bodies which, like the United Nations, have functions and goals completely unrelated to sports.

"The Dominican Olympic Committee sincerely regrets that it cannot comply with the request in the above-mentioned communication because it has been made by an unauthorized body.

g/ It was indicated that a copy of the letter had been sent to the Secretariat of State for Sports, Physical Education and Recreation of the Dominican Republic.

h/ See the note dated 7 October 1975, transmitted to all Member States of the United Nations, the text of which was reproduced in the Committee's eighth report, S/11927/Rev.1, vol. I, annex II, (175) Case No. 181, para. 12.

"With sincere wishes of friendship, we greet you very cordially, in the name of the Olympic ideal and under the motto 'HARMONY, ORGANIZATION AND LABOUR'."

4. A reply dated 26 February 1976 was received from the Permanent Representative of the Central African Republic, transmitting a letter dated 23 January 1976 addressed to him by the Minister for Youth, Sports and Culture of the Central African Republic, Bangui. The substantive part of that letter reads as follows:

"We have received your letter of 24 October 1975 concerning the note sent by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in pursuance of the request of the Security Council to the Governments of States Members of the United Nations, to draw the attention of football clubs and associations in their countries to the Committee's refusal to recognize the National Football Association of Rhodesia as a member of the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA), and the exclusion of the Football Association of Rhodesia from the International Federation.

"Accordingly, I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter and to assure you of the full support of the Central African Football Association."

(181) Case No. 186. Southern Rhodesia and the World Chess Federation (FIDE): information obtained from published sources

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

(182) Case No. 191. New Zealand cricket club tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 275th meeting on 16 July, a note dated 30 July 1976 was sent to New Zealand, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee considered the reply dated 12 December 1975 from the Permanent Mission of New Zealand concerning a tour to Southern Rhodesia by a cricket club of New Zealand. The Committee was grateful for the additional information it contained, in particular concerning the banking facilities used by the New Zealand team during that trip, the carriers which transported it to and from Southern Rhodesia and the general itinerary.

"The Committee noted that it had been ascertained by the New Zealand authorities that members of the Tui Cricket Club had employed the usual banking channels in applying for funds to travel overseas, that these funds were freely convertible and could be used anywhere in the world, and that the Reserve Bank of New Zealand was not able to exercise control over the

funds once they had been issued. The Committee also noted that the New Zealand authorities had been informed, inter alia, that the Tui Cricket Club had played four matches in Southern Rhodesia. In view of these facts and bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) as well as the statement in His Excellency's note of 12 December 1975, that under New Zealand's 'the United Nations Sanctions (Southern Rhodesia) Regulations 1968' a New Zealand citizen may not cause funds to be transferred to Southern Rhodesia either directly or indirectly. The Committee expressed disappointment that the New Zealand Government was satisfied, as stated in the earlier note dated 26 March 1975, that, in the present case, there was no evidence capable of sustaining a prosecution for any alleged breach of the Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and of the pertinent New Zealand legislation which implemented sanctions against Southern Rhodesia."

(183) Case No. 192. Hockey club tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A first reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 26 January 1976.
4. A reply dated 11 February 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations ... with reference to the Secretary-General's notes of 13 October 1975 and 26 January 1976, and further to his own note of 3 March 1975, has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that a painstaking search of several archives has produced the following additional information concerning the trip, in September 1974, of a team of senior players of the Hockey-Club Frankfurt 1880 to Southern Rhodesia:

"(i) Carriers: scheduled aircraft of several international airlines were used; details can, however, no longer be ascertained, except in the cases indicated in parentheses in the itinerary below.

"(ii) Itinerary:

31 August 1974: Frankfurt-Rome-Lusaka
2 September 1974: Lusaka-Blantyre
4 September 1974: Blantyre-Salisbury (Rhodesian Airways)
6 September 1974: Salisbury-Wankie National Park (Rhodesian Airways)
9 September 1974: Wankie-Johannesburg.

"The dates for the remaining flights from Johannesburg to Kapstadt-Durban-Mauritius and to Frankfurt can no longer be established.

"(iii) Banking arrangements: According to the management of the Hockey-Club Frankfurt 1880, the entire trip was privately financed by the participants.

No public funds were used either in the preparation or for the incidental expenses of the trip which had a predominantly tourist character."

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 275th meeting on 16 July, a note dated 30 July 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee examined attentively the reply dated 11 February 1976 from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the case referred to above, together with the earlier reply dated 3 March 1975. In view of the statement contained in His Excellency's earlier noted dated 3 March 1975 that no fund had been transferred from the Federal Republic of Germany to Southern Rhodesia as the players and their wives had been the guests of the host clubs, the Committee was puzzled by the statement contained in the note dated 11 February 1976 that according to the management of the Hockey-Club Frankfurt 1880, the entire trip had been privately financed by the participants and that therefore no public funds had been used either in the preparation or for the incidental expenses of the trip. The Committee felt that in order to complete its consideration of this case, it would be necessary and useful for it to receive further details on the tour, in particular clarification regarding the apparent inconsistency of information as to how the trip had been financed. If it should be ascertained that the trip was privately financed by the participants, the Committee would appreciate obtaining information as to how the transfer of private funds to Southern Rhodesia is facilitated, bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"The Committee would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter, at its earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

6. An acknowledgement dated 23 August 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, followed by a reply dated 15 September 1976, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"To clear up the seeming inconsistency of information as to the financing of the trip to Southern Rhodesia by the Hockey-Club Frankfurt 1880 in this Mission's notes of 3 March 1975 and 11 February 1976, the Federal Government again contacted the Club's management and was able to elicit the following additional information:

"In accordance with established practice in air traffic, the participants made full prepayment on their flight tickets in the Federal Republic of Germany, using private funds. On the other hand, the expenses incurred by

them while in Southern Rhodesia were defrayed by their private hosts and host sports clubs in that country, respectively, which obviated the need for any currency transfer.

"In the light of the foregoing, it would, therefore, seem that the appearance of an inconsistency was misleading and that the matter can now be considered closed, all the more so as two years have elapsed since the trip was undertaken and no new light can be shed on the circumstances surrounding it."

(184) Case No. 198. Southern Rhodesia and golf championships in Colombia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A second reminder was sent to Colombia on 27 January 1976.
4. A reply dated 12 April, which crossed with the third reminder sent to that Government on 14 April 1976, was received from the Permanent Mission of Colombia, transmitting the text of a note dated 11 April 1976 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia. The substantive text of that note reads as follows:

"... Attached is a copy of communication SG-011 of 9 February 1976 from the Secretary-General of the Colombian Institute of Youth and Sports on the problem of the participation of Rhodesia in sports events.

"The Colombian Golf Federation has also been requested to reply to the questionnaire from the Secretary-General of the United Nations on Rhodesia's participation in a golf championship in Colombia in 1975. Since the direction of sports is independent of political organizations, including the Government itself, its leaders are reluctant to afford any type of co-operation in investigations such as that requested by the United Nations."

Attachment

"... We have discussed the matter in question with the Colombian Olympic Committee, the organization responsible for the international sports activities of the Colombian federations, and its President, Mr. Humberto Chica Pinzon, has informed us that the appropriate measures have been taken by that Committee.

"The Colombian Olympic Committee has informed its subsidiary organizations, specifically the Colombian Tennis Federation and the Colombian Golf Federation, of the decisions of the United Nations, which are in keeping with the Olympic spirit of non-discrimination in various matters, and those Federations have agreed in future to adopt the honourable position taken by the United Nations.

"Moreover, although it is up to the Colombian Football Federation and the Colombian Swimming Federation to take the position they deem best with regard to the readmission of the Rhodesian Federations to the corresponding

International Federations, both we and the Colombian Olympic Committee agree with the views expressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his recommendation to the Permanent Mission of Colombia in New York, and the Colombian organizations responsible for the direction of the sports of football and swimming are being informed of his views.

(Signed) Enrique Perozzo García
Secretary-General"

5. In accordance with the no-objection procedure a note was prepared for transmission to Colombia, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee has seen His Excellency's reply of 12 April 1976 and has particularly expressed its appreciation for the positive attitude shown by the Colombian Institute of Youth and Sports and by the Colombian Olympic Committee with regard to the Committee's general appeal for ostracization of Southern Rhodesia from the various international sports organizations. The Committee would welcome assurance that the Colombian authorities concerned would always maintain that attitude whenever the question of Southern Rhodesia's membership, or participation in the activities, of such organizations should come up.

"With regard to the particular case in question mentioned above, however, the Committee noted with regret that His Excellency's Government was unable to secure the information requested in the Secretary-General's note of 24 September 1975. The Committee believes that the Colombian authorities could have been in a position at least to ascertain whether any individuals from Southern Rhodesia had been admitted into Colombia, and, if so, information might have been available on their names, the nature of their travel documents, the means of transportation used by them and the financial facilities given to them.

"The Committee expressed the hope that His Excellency's Government might yet be able to obtain that information and transmit it at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

6. However, the proposed note was not sent to Colombia, as a further reply dated 13 May 1976 was received from that Government, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretariat of the United Nations and, further to communication No. 336 of 2 April 1976 concerning the participation of Rhodesia in sport events, reproduces below the text of the note received from the Colombian Golf Federation through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia:

"..."

"1. Rhodesia was among the countries selected to participate in the Second International Amateur Pairs Tournament at the Club El Rincón.

"2. In view of the objections raised by the Permanent Representative of Colombia, this Federation wrote to the federations of the countries concerned cancelling that invitation.

"3. The Club El Rincón, where the Tournament was to be held, issued individual invitations to two amateur players from that country; it felt that such invitations could not be open to any objection because no official invitation was involved, inasmuch as the Club is a private non-profit corporation.

"4. The Organizing Committee of the Tournament paid for the fares and the accommodation of these players, whose names are Dennis Watson and George Harvey of Rhodesia."

7. In accordance with the Committee's decision at its 275th meeting, a note dated 10 August 1976 was sent to Colombia, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee has seen His Excellency's replies of 12 April and 13 May 1976 and has particularly expressed its appreciation for the positive attitude shown by the Colombian Institute of Youth and Sports and by the Colombian Olympic Committee with regard to the Committee's general appeal for ostracization of Southern Rhodesia from the various international sports organizations. The Committee would welcome assurance that the Colombian authorities concerned would always maintain that attitude whenever the question of Southern Rhodesia's membership in, or participation in the activities of, such organizations should come up.

"With regard to the particular case in question mentioned above, the Committee reiterated its position that participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly when that event was of a representative nature, was contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia even when such participation involved two amateur players to whom individual invitations had been extended. Furthermore, the Committee considered that under the circumstances, the admission into Colombia of persons, such as the two players in question, ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia might have been in conflict with the provisions of paragraph 5 (b) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). In this connexion, the Committee would like to refer to the queries raised in the Secretary-General's note dated 24 September 1975 and express the hope that His Excellency's Government may yet be able to obtain and transmit to the Committee information concerning the type and the country of origin of the documents with which the players had travelled to Colombia, the means of transportation used by them and the financial facilities given to them.

"The Committee would appreciate receiving comments and information referred to above at the earliest convenience of His Excellency's Government and, if possible, within one month."

8. First, second and third reminders were sent to Colombia on 11 October, 12 November and 15 December 1976.

9. In the absence of a reply from Colombia, within the prescribed period of two months the Committee included that Government in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

(185) Case No. 199. Golf championships in the Dominican Republic (1974): information obtained from published sources

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

(186) Case No. 205. Irish Rugby team tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

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

(187) Case No. 211. Tour of certain European countries by Southern Rhodesian hockey club: information obtained from published sources

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

(188) Case No. 215. Southern Rhodesia and the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGS): information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(189) Case No. 216. United States basketball coach tour of Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the representative of the United States made a statement to the effect that the United States Government would endeavour to determine whether any illegal transfer of funds had been involved. His delegation would provide the Committee with that information as soon as it was available. In the meantime, he said, his delegation had no objection to the proposal that the case should remain open.
4. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement concerning several cases under consideration. The text of that part of the statement pertaining to this case is reproduced below:

"Concerning Case Nos. 216, 234, 275 and INGO-10, it is not possible, under the United States Constitution, for the United States Government to

prevent individuals from travelling as individuals, even in an organized tour, if there is no official sponsorship. However, as our delegation has stated several times before this Committee, instructions have gone out to all United States consular posts in the world to actively discourage United States citizens from travelling to Southern Rhodesia."

(190) Case No. 217. Argentinian hockey umpire visit to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Acknowledgements dated 22 and 31 December 1975 were received from the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada, respectively.
4. Replies were received from the General Secretary of the International Hockey Federation (FIH) and Japan, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(a) Letter dated 11 February 1976 from the General Secretary of FIH

"The Council of the FIH met on 31 January and 2 February 1976 and I reported on this matter reading out the letters that we exchanged since your first one of 30 October 1975.

"It was decided to set up an ad-hoc sub-committee to study the case in the light of the information conveyed by your correspondence, and which will make a recommendation at a subsequent meeting on the Council."

(b) Note dated 27 February 1976 from Japan

"The Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations ... with reference to /the Secretary-General's/ note dated 15 December 1975 (case No. 217) has the honour to inform him that the Government of Japan, in its letter dated 8 January 1976, communicated the said note to the President of the Japan Hockey Association and drew the Association's attention to the matter in question as requested in the note.

"The Permanent Representative of Japan has further the honour to inform the Secretary-General that, in its reply, the Japan Hockey Association acknowledged receipt of the letter of the Government of Japan and assured the Government that it would pay due attention to the matter in conformity with the advice that the Government had given in its letter."

(191) Case No. 219. Southern Rhodesia and the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF): information obtained from published sources

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

3. In view of the information received from the Secretary of the Davis Cup Nations that the so-called Rhodesian Lawn Tennis Association had been duly readmitted into the Davis Cup Competition on the basis of its continued full membership of ILTF, the Committee felt it necessary to renew its appeal to that body to take the necessary measures that would result in Southern Rhodesia's expulsion from membership. A note to that effect, it was recalled, had already been addressed to all Member States whose national tennis associations were members of ILTF. Accordingly, a letter dated 12 February 1976 was sent by the Chairman to ILTF, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee noted with great concern that the so-called Rhodesian Lawn Tennis Association still continues to enjoy full membership of the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF) and that, as a result of that membership, it has been readmitted into the Davis Cup Competition without objection from the participant members.

"The Committee has already addressed itself to all the Member States of the United Nations whose national associations belong to ILTF, requesting them, among other things, to draw this matter to the attention of the associations under their jurisdiction. In my letter of 26 September 1975, you also were kindly requested to raise to ILTF the Committee's appeal for complete implementation, both in letter and spirit, of the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council. While still awaiting the response of ILTF on the matter, the Committee wishes to renew and extend its appeal to the Davis Cup Committee of Management in the hope that appropriate measures will be taken to effect the expulsion of the Southern Rhodesian association from that organization.

"The Committee again indicated that it would appreciate it if this communication could be circulated to all national lawn tennis associations members of ILTF."

4. An acknowledgement dated 25 February 1976 was received from the General Secretary of ILTF, also the Secretary of the Davis Cup Nations, indicating that the letter would be put before the Committee of Management of ILTF at their meeting in April as well as before the Committee of Management of the Davis Cup Nations.

5. A reply dated 15 April 1976 was received from the Secretary of the Davis Cup Nations, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I am writing with reference to your letter dated 12 February addressed to the International Lawn Tennis Federation, a copy of which has been received by the Committee of Management of the Davis Cup Nations.

"I am instructed by the Committee to inform you that Rhodesia was accepted as a Davis Cup Nation some years ago.

"Under Davis Cup regulations, the challenge of Rhodesia or any other nation can only be refused by the annual general meeting of the Davis Cup Nations, provided that such motion is carried by a majority of at least three quarters of those present and voting. It is clear therefore that any question of possible expulsion or non-acceptance of entry can rest with the annual meeting only.

"I have also been asked to inform you that the Davis Cup Committee of Management do not intend to put forward to the annual meeting any recommendation that action should be taken against Rhodesia."

6. A reply dated 20 May 1976 was also received from the General Secretary of ILTF, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have been asked to inform you that your letter of 12 February has been received by the Committee of Management of the International Lawn Tennis Federation.

"They have asked me to stress that they are firmly of the opinion that there must be no political interference in our sport. Furthermore, the Committee of Management note with pleasure that the International Olympic Committee are also taking a stand against political interference and have stated that any countries or athletes who withdraw from competitions for political considerations will be suspended from the Olympic movement.

"I am sure you will understand that this Federation has a duty to lawn tennis players and clubs, and tournaments and championships held throughout the world. Therefore any disciplinary action taken, and any admission to or expulsion from the ILTF, must be decided in accordance with the rules of this organization."

7. In view of the replies received from the Davis Cup Nations organization and from ILTF, a further letter dated 28 June 1976, signed by the Chairman of the Committee and a note of the same date were sent, under the no-objection procedure, to the Davis Cup Nations organization and to the States Members of that organization, i/ respectively. The substantive parts of the letter and the note are reproduced below.

(i) Letter to the Secretary of Davis Cup Nations

"At the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to refer to your letter of 15 April 1976 concerning the participation of Southern Rhodesia in the Davis Cup competitions. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the information supplied and for the co-operation it has thus far received from the Davis Cup Nations organization in this matter.

"The Committee felt, however, that the matter could be explored further with a view to finally effect the expulsion of Southern Rhodesia both from

i/ The countries involved in the 1976 Davis Cup competition included: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, United Kingdom, United States, USSR, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

participation in the Davis Cup competitions and from membership of ILTF. It was somewhat puzzled in this regard as to the proper authority that could ultimately effect such expulsion. It had gained the impression from your earlier letter of 20 November 1975 that Southern Rhodesia was entitled to participate in the Davis Cup by virtue of its membership in ILTF. It was on that basis that the Committee addressed itself to ILTF through my letter to you of 12 February 1976. In your reply of 15 April, on the other hand, it is indicated that, under the Davis Cup regulations, participation in the cup competition by Southern Rhodesia or any other nation can be refused by the Annual General Meeting of the Davis Cup Nations, subject to the necessary majority of the members attending and voting.

"In view of the foregoing the Committee expressed disappointment that the Davis Cup Committee of Management did not intend to recommend to the annual general meeting any action against Southern Rhodesia. The Security Council Committee wished to draw attention to its position that participation of Southern Rhodesia in international sports competitions, particularly where such participation appears to be of a representational nature, is certainly contrary to the spirit and intent of the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council against the illegal régime in that territory. It expressed the hope, therefore, that the Davis Cup Committee of Management might reconsider its own position and initiate appropriate action against Southern Rhodesia at the organization's annual general meeting."

(ii) Note to States members of the Davis Cup Nations

"For some time now, the Committee, in performance of the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council, has actively sought the expulsion of Southern Rhodesia from membership of various international sports organizations, including ILTF and the Davis Cup Nations. It regards Southern Rhodesia's membership thereof to be certainly contrary to the spirit and intent of the mandatory sanctions established by the Security Council against the illegal régime in that territory. It has therefore addressed itself directly to the two bodies mentioned above in that connexion and has appealed, through their Governments, to the national tennis associations that belong to ILTF, for any measures that they might take to ensure Southern Rhodesia's expulsion from those organizations.

"The Committee has received a reply from ILTF and is still considering the response of that organization to its appeal. Meanwhile the Committee has been informed by the Davis Cup Committee of Management that the question of Southern Rhodesia's expulsion from the Davis Cup Nations is a matter for that organization's annual general meeting, where an affirmative vote of 3/4 of all the members present and voting is required. Bearing this information in mind, the Committee decided to address itself urgently to His Excellency's Government in the hope that the Government might use its influence over the delegation to the annual general meeting of the Davis Cup Nations, so that the question may be duly raised and the desired result achieved at that meeting.

"The Committee would be grateful to receive at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month, any assurances or other comments that His Excellency's Government may be able to make on this matter."

8. An acknowledgement dated 30 June 1976 was received from Switzerland.

9. Replies were received from Hungary, Sweden, New Zealand, Canada, the Netherlands, Australia, Bulgaria, Denmark, Norway and Japan, as well as from the Secretary of the Davis Cup Nations organization, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 14 July 1976 from Hungary

"The Hungarian Government is in full agreement with those countries which support the expulsion of Southern Rhodesia from membership of the Davis Cup Nations.

"Therefore at the annual general meeting of the Davis Cup Nations the Hungarian delegation will vote in favor of the expulsion of Southern Rhodesia from membership of that organization."

(ii) Note dated 19 July 1976 from Sweden

"The Acting Permanent Representative of Sweden has not failed to transmit the note to the Swedish Government which has informed the Swedish Sports Federation of its contents."

(iii) Note dated 27 July 1976 from New Zealand

"The Permanent Representative has the honour to state, on instructions from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand, that New Zealand has supported and applied the mandatory sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council and will continue to do so. It has already declined to give an undertaking requested by the New Zealand Golf Association which would have allowed for the entry of Rhodesian players to participate in two international tournaments. As a consequence, New Zealand has been barred from hosting the tournaments concerned.

"The New Zealand Government's decision regarding the admission of Rhodesian golfers received widespread publicity in New Zealand and New Zealand tennis organizations have thus been made aware of the difficulties and limitations they could face as a consequence of continued Rhodesian membership of the major world tennis bodies. Their delegates will be able to take these into account in considering what attitude to adopt to the issue of Rhodesian membership. The New Zealand Government recognizes that New Zealand sporting bodies are autonomous, and has a firmly held policy of non-interference in their affairs. Their decisions on the policies of the international bodies to which they are affiliated are their own responsibility and the New Zealand Government does not believe it proper to interfere. It is not therefore in a position to exert influence on the New Zealand delegation to the meeting of the Davis Cup Nations."

(iv) Letter dated 27 July 1976 from the Secretary of the Davis Cup Nations organization

"Thank you for your letter ref. PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) Case No. 219 received on 3 July. This will be placed before the Davis Cup Committee of Management at their meeting in November.

"In the meantime I would like to clarify the position by stating that only members of the ILTF are eligible to compete in the Davis Cup competition, but that entries for each competition are placed before the Davis Cup annual general meeting held soon after entries are received, when that meeting may decide to refuse the challenge of any country. To refuse such a challenge, a majority of 80 per cent of those present and voting is required."

(v) Note dated 28 July 1976 from Canada

"The Permanent Mission of Canada wishes to assure the Secretary-General that the Canadian Government, in line with its established practice in cases of this nature, will draw to the attention of the appropriate Canadian sporting groups the concern which has been expressed by the Security Council Sanctions Committee, along with a statement of Canadian policy which reflects the Government's clear support for the implementation of the Rhodesian sanctions established by the Security Council."

(vi) Note dated 29 July 1976 from Australia

"The Australian Government has been advised by the Lawn Tennis Association of Australia that at the annual general meeting of the Davis Cup Nations in London on 1 July 1976 the representative of the Lawn Tennis Association of Australia voted in favour of a motion 'that Southern Rhodesia's entry for 1977 not be accepted'."

(vii) Note dated 4 August 1976 from the Netherlands

"The questions raised in the above-mentioned note have been brought to the attention of the Royal Netherlands Lawn Tennis Federation. The Netherlands Government has on that occasion informed the Federation that it attaches great importance to the implementation of the sanctions against the Smith régime, both to the letter and to the spirit.

"Since the Royal Netherlands Lawn Tennis Federation is a private organization, the Netherlands Government is not in a position to issue binding instructions regarding the actions of the Federation in connexion with international tennis tournaments."

(viii) Note dated 11 August 1976 from Bulgaria

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the efforts of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) aimed at seeking the expulsion of Southern Rodesia from membership of various international sports organizations.

"In this connexion, the People's Republic of Bulgaria shares the view of the Security Council Committee that Southern Rodesia's membership in the International Lawn Tennis Federation and the Davis Cup Nations runs counter to the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council upon the illegal régime in Southern Rodesia.

"In view of the aforementioned, the Bulgarian Tennis Federation shall insist on Southern Rodesia being expelled from the ILTF and the Davis Cup

Nations and shall vote accordingly at the annual meeting of the Davis Cup Nations.

"In conveying these comments of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Permanent Mission avails itself of this opportunity to assure His Excellency once again of Bulgaria's unfailing support for the endeavours of the United Nations to achieve the speedy liquidation of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid with the view to assisting all colonial peoples to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)."

(ix) Note dated 18 August 1976 from Denmark

"The Secretary-General's note has been brought to the attention of the 'Dansk Idræts-Forbund', which is the non-governmental association of Danish sport organizations. The Constitution of Denmark does not enable the Danish Government to influence Danish sport organizations or their members concerning the question of the membership of Southern Rhodesia of ILTF and the Davis Cup Nations."

(x) Note dated 24 August 1976 from Norway

"The Norwegian Government has transmitted a copy of the Secretary-General's note dated 28 June 1976 together with Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and relevant Norwegian laws and regulations for the implementation of the above-mentioned resolution, to the Norwegian Tennis Association.

"According to these laws and regulations, passports issued by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia are not recognized by Norwegian authorities. Individuals carrying such passports are therefore not allowed to enter Norway."

(xi) Note dated 8 December 1976 from Japan

"The Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations ..., with reference to the Secretary-General's note of 28 June 1976, has the honour to inform him that the Japanese Government conveyed the above-mentioned note to the President of the Japan Lawn Tennis Association and requested the Association to co-operate by an official letter dated 2 August 1976."

(192) Case No. 220. Southern Rhodesia and the International Amateur Swimming Federation (FINA): information obtained from published sources

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

(193) Case No. 222. Participation of Southern Rhodesian yachtsmen in the World Fireball Regatta in France: information obtained from published sources

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

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. First and second reminders were sent to France on 12 January and 18 February 1976, respectively.
4. A reply dated 25 February 1976 was received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that it has drawn to the attention of the French Government the information contained in his note concerning case No. 222. The French Government immediately ordered an investigation.

"After checking, the Secretariat of State for Youth and Sports was able to confirm that two Rhodesian athletes had indeed participated in the World Fireball Regatta held in France.

"If the two persons concerned had entered France on Rhodesian passports, they would have been turned back at the frontier in accordance with the orders which have been given. However, since they carried non-Rhodesian passports, no measure could be taken against them. Nevertheless, in order to prevent the recurrence of incidents of this kind, the Secretariat of State for Youth and Sports has sent a letter to the President of the French Sailing Federation called on him to issue full instructions to all the organizations which are members of the Federation to ensure that there is no recurrence of such incidents."

5. A note dated 7 April 1976 was sent to France under the no-objection procedure, requesting the information originally sought by the Committee, namely the full names of the participants from Southern Rhodesia, the nature of the travel documents and the means of transport used by them to travel to France and back to Southern Rhodesia.

6. A reply dated 20 April 1976 was received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations ... confirms that the surnames and first names of the Southern Rhodesian sportsmen are those given in the newspaper item to which reference was made (the Rhodesia Herald of 25 September 1975).

"It points out, however, that, as stated in its letter No. 68 of 25 February, since the two persons involved entered France with passports that were not Rhodesian it is unable to supply any information as to the kind of documents or the means of transport that were used."

(194) Case No. 223. International squash tournament in Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

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

3. A note dated 23 December 1975 was sent to Pakistan, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee has seen His Excellency's reply of 28 October 1975 concerning the case referred to above and has expressed its appreciation for it. It has indicated, however, that the Pakistan authorities might have inadvertently omitted to note the name of another individual squash player known as Hiddy Jahan and referred to as a Pakistani in the newspaper report, a copy of which was enclosed with the Secretary-General's note of 20 October 1975. It was in respect of that player that the Committee requested His Excellency's Government to undertake the necessary investigations to determine the circumstances in which he had travelled to Southern Rhodesia and participated in an international squash tournament there, as the newspaper report indicated. The name of the other player, Sharif Khan, referred to in the report as 'Pakistani turned Canadian', has already been forwarded to the Canadian Government with a request for similar investigations.

"The Committee expressed the hope that the Pakistani authorities would extend their investigations to include Mr. Hiddy Jahan and forward to it their findings at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

4. Replies were received from Australia and Canada, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 6 January 1976 from Australia

"The information contained in the Secretary-General's note has been referred to the appropriate authorities in Australia for investigation. The Secretary-General may be assured that a thorough investigation will be undertaken and appropriate action will follow if any evidence is found of any breach of the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"The Secretary-General will be aware of the opposition of the Australian Government to the pretensions of the illegal régime and of its strict adherence to the sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

"The results of the investigation of the information contained in the Secretary-General's note will be conveyed to the Secretary-General as soon as they are available."

(ii) Note dated 28 January 1976 from Canada

"The Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to his note of 20 October 1975 relating to the reported participation of a Canadian, Mr. Sharif Khan, in an international squash tournament held in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, in September 1975.

"The Permanent Mission of Canada wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the individual concerned participated in the above-referenced tournament on his own, and not as a representative of Canada or of any Canadian organization. No government support was extended to him either directly or indirectly.

"As the Secretary-General is aware, the Canadian Government does not interfere with the right of individuals to travel where they wish (including Southern Rhodesia). With regard to the question of travel and other arrangements in this case and in others that have been investigated, it would appear that the tickets for travel to Rhodesia were obtained and paid for outside Canada, as such transactions inside Canada are prohibited by the Canadian-Rhodesia Regulations. The Canadian Association of Travel Agents is aware of this constraint and has advised members accordingly. Investigations in this regard have not so far produced evidence of any violation of the Canadian regulations."

5. A first reminder was sent to Egypt on 4 February 1976.
6. A reply dated 19 February 1976 was received from Egypt, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations ... has the honour to transmit to the Secretary-General the following information concerning a squash player who participated in the international squash tournament held at Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, in September 1975.

"The player, Ahmed Safwat, was of Egyptian nationality until January 1971. Since that date Ahmed Safwat has resided in the United Kingdom. As a professional squash player, he plays for the Abbeydale Club in Sheffield, the United Kingdom.

"He took part in the international squash tournament in Salisbury as a professional player.

"He has not represented Egypt since January 1971."

7. A first reminder was sent to Pakistan on 2 March 1976.
8. A reply dated 10 March 1976 has been received from Pakistan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations ... has the honour to state that appropriate disciplinary action has been taken against Mr. Hidayat (Hiddy) Jahan, a leading squash player of the country, for having played in Southern Rhodesia despite clear instructions from the Government to the contrary. The Pakistan Squash Racket Federation have debarred him from playing squash in Pakistan or from representing the Pakistan Squash Racket Federation in any capacity outside the country. The Government of Pakistan, in continuation of the above disciplinary action, have decided that Mr. Hidayat Jahan may not be allowed to play in any recognized championship of squash as a Pakistani player.

"It is regretted that the above information could not be communicated earlier even though the Government of Pakistan had taken immediate notice of this contravention."

9. In view of the reply from Egypt, a note dated 23 March 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has seen His Excellency's reply dated 4 November 1975 concerning the above-mentioned case, for which it has expressed its appreciation, and which is receiving due consideration.

"Meanwhile, the Committee has received additional information from the Government of Egypt in a note dated 19 February 1976, in which it is stated that one of the international squash players, known as Ahmed Safwat, and originally reported to be an Egyptian national, has since 1971 resided in the United Kingdom, where he plays professionally for the Abbeydale Club in Sheffield, and from where he travelled to Southern Rhodesia and participated in the international squash tournament there in September 1975.

"The Committee decided that this information should also be brought to the attention of the United Kingdom with a request that the investigations already undertaken by the United Kingdom authorities in respect of the United Kingdom player, Jonah Barrington, be extended to include the activities of Ahmed Safwat as well.

"The Committee indicated that it would welcome receiving the findings of the United Kingdom investigating authorities at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

10. A reply dated 31 March 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the text of which was read to the Committee at the 267th meeting. The substantive part of that reply is reproduced below:

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have explained on a number of previous occasions that they have no means of preventing individual travel to Southern Rhodesia. Nor have they any means of checking whether Mr. Ahmed Safwat in fact travelled to Southern Rhodesia on his Egyptian or any other travel document.

"Although where possible prospective participants in sporting events in Southern Rhodesia are warned of the likely consequences of their visits, no warning was possible in this case as the authorities had no advance warning of Mr. Safwat's intentions. There can be no doubt, however, that any sportsman resident in the United Kingdom is well aware of the opposition of the Government of the United Kingdom to sporting exchanges in Southern Rhodesia.

"The United Kingdom authorities have no evidence that Mr. Ahmed Safwat contravened exchange control regulations, nor any other domestic sanctions legislation."

11. A note dated 6 April 1976 was sent to Pakistan, under the no-objection procedure, expressing the Committee's appreciation for the action taken by that Government with regard to the Pakistan squash player who had played in Southern Rhodesia and also expressing the Committee's hope that the greatest vigilance would continue to be exercised by the relevant authorities to ensure that mandatory sanctions of the Security Council were strictly enforced.

12. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 28 April 1976 at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(195) Case No. 224. Participation of Southern Rhodesia in the World Ploughing Match in Canada: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 12 February 1976 was received from Canada, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to [the Secretary-General's] note of 20 October 1975 (Case No. 220) concerning the reported participation of Rhodesians in the World Ploughing Match held in Oshawa, Ontario on 23-27 September 1975.

"The Permanent Mission of Canada wishes to advise the Secretary-General that the responsible Canadian authorities have undertaken an investigation of this matter and have ascertained that five individuals resident in Rhodesia did participate in the match in question. Particulars of the individuals concerned are attached. You will note that all were travelling on passports other than Rhodesian. To the best of our knowledge, these persons were participating in the World Ploughing Match as individuals and had no official connexion with the Government of Rhodesia. In the light of subsequent reports it is evident that the participants were at least to some extent representing Rhodesia. For this reason, the Canadian authorities are now reviewing the requirements relating to entry of Rhodesians to Canada with a view to preventing the recurrence of situations such as that relating to the World Ploughing Match."

Attachment

"Alec Youden Philip - Chairman, Rhodesian Ploughing Association - United Kingdom passport - arrived Toronto international airport on 17 September 1975 on Alitalia flight - presumably from Rome - means of transportation from Rhodesia to Rome not known.

"Robert Eldon Boswell - Team Manager - United Kingdom passport - arrived Toronto international airport on 17 September 1975 on Air Canada flight from London England - means of transportation from Rhodesia to London not known.

"Ray Beverley Fuller - Participant and Team Organizer - South African passport - arrived Toronto international airport 17 September 1975 on Alitalia flight from Rome - means of transportation from Rhodesia to Rome not known.

"Michael McLannahan Williams - Participant - South African passport - arrived Toronto international airport 17 September 1975 on Alitalia flight from Rome - means of transportation from Rhodesia to Rome not known.

"Robert Dudley Scott - Friend of participants - United Kingdom passport - arrived Toronto international airport 17 September 1975 on Alitalia flight from Rome - means of transportation from Rhodesia to Rome not known."

(196) Case No. 225. Visit of English polo team to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have looked into the question of participation by British polo players in a tournament in Salisbury in September 1975. They confirm that their participation was in a purely private capacity and that they did not represent in any way an official or semi-official British team.

"Although the United Kingdom Government discourages sporting visits to Southern Rhodesia, in the absence of a total ban on travel to the territory it cannot prevent individuals from travelling if that is their wish. As far as possible, however, prospective sporting visitors are warned of the consequences of their visit and told they may be lending support to the pretensions of the illegal régime. The United Kingdom authorities also ensure, to the best of their ability, that there is no breach of exchange control regulations or other sanctions legislation.

"However, as the Committee will be aware, it is common practice for sporting figures to have all their expenses, including travelling expenses, paid by the organizers of competitions or games in which they are taking part.

"The United Kingdom Government have long held the view that no British sportsmen or sporting teams should participate in sporting events in Southern Rhodesia. They will continue to make known to those concerned their fundamental opposition to such visits."

4. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(197) Case No. 226. International Wanderers cricket team visit to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 New Zealand and the United Kingdom, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 23 December 1975 from New Zealand

"The New Zealand authorities, in view of the fact that the tour was organized in and directed from the United Kingdom and that the New Zealand player concerned resides in the United Kingdom during the northern cricket season, are unable to add anything to the press report forwarded by the Sanctions Committee. They would suggest that the Committee direct its inquiries to the authorities concerned, who may be in a position to furnish the Committee with the information it requests."

(ii) Note dated 14 January 1976 from the United Kingdom

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have looked into the question of participation by British cricketers in a tour of Southern Rhodesia in September 1975. They confirm that their participation was in a purely private capacity and that they did not represent in any way an official or semi-official British team.

"Although the United Kingdom Government discourages sporting visits to Southern Rhodesia, in the absence of a total ban on travel to the Territory it cannot prevent individuals from travelling if that is their wish. As far as possible, however, prospective sporting visitors are warned of the consequences of their visit and told they may be lending support to the pretensions of the illegal régime. The United Kingdom authorities also ensure, to the best of their ability, that there is no breach of exchange control regulations or other sanctions legislation.

"However, as the Committee will be aware, it is common practice for sporting figures to have all their expenses, including travelling expenses, paid by the organizers of competitions or games in which they are taking part.

"The United Kingdom Government have long held the view that no British sportsmen or sporting teams should participate in sporting events in Southern Rhodesia. They will continue to make known to those concerned their fundamental opposition to such visits."

4. A first reminder was sent to Pakistan on 26 January 1976.

5. A reply dated 4 February 1976 was received from Pakistan, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Government of Pakistan has inquired into the matter and wishes to bring the following to the attention of the Secretary-General:

"One of the members of the team International Wanderers, Mr. Mohammad Ilyas, toured Australia as a member of Pakistan cricket team in 1971-1972. While playing in Australia he suffered a serious head injury and was, therefore, left behind when the Pakistanis proceeded on their tour of New Zealand. Instead of returning home to Pakistan, Mr. Ilyas decided to stay in Sydney and became a cricket coach at a local club. He subsequently married a British national. Since then, Mr. Mohammad Ilyas has been a permanent resident of Australia and has visited the United Kingdom from time to time. It is presumed that he has taken Australian nationality since he would not otherwise have been able to stay in that country. The Board

of Cricket Control in Pakistan has imposed a ban on Mr. M. Ilyas playing any more cricket in Pakistan.

"Another member of the Wanderers team, Mr. Yunus Ahmad, currently plays professional cricket for Surrey County (UK) and holds dual nationality. He first visited South Africa in 1973 with the D. H. Robbins XI and was consequently banned by the Board of Cricket Control in Pakistan. In 1974, Mr. Y. Ahmad sought to be exonerated by the Board, but while the matter was under consideration, he proceeded to Rhodesia with the above-mentioned team. The Board of Cricket Control in Pakistan taking note of this action in September 1974, permanently banned Mr. Yunus Ahmad from playing cricket in or for Pakistan."

6. Notes dated 11 March 1976 were sent to Australia, Barbados, Pakistan and the United Kingdom, under the no-objection procedure. In the case of Australia and the United Kingdom, the notes transmitted to those Governments the information received from Pakistan and requested them to investigate the matter with regard to the cricket players given by Pakistan to be of their nationality. Similarly, the note to Barbados transmitted to that Government the information received from Trinidad and Tobago and requested it to investigate the matter with regard to the two players given to be nationals of Barbados. The note to Pakistan expressed the Committee's appreciation for the action taken by that Government with regard to the Pakistan cricketer who had played in Southern Rhodesia and also expressed the Committee's hope that the greatest vigilance would continue to be exercised by the relevant authorities to ensure that mandatory sanctions of the Security Council were strictly enforced.

7. A reply dated 19 March was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note, reference number PO 230 SORH (1-2-1), dated 24 November 1975, relating to Case No. 226 concerning information received by the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia.

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have made enquiries concerning the participation of Yunus Ahmad in the Wanderers' cricket tour of Southern Rhodesia but on the information available to them are unable to confirm whether he has dual Pakistani/British nationality.

"The authorities point out that even if it were established that Yunus Ahmad has British nationality, they have no means of checking that he travelled to Southern Rhodesia on whatever British travel document he possesses.

"As the United Kingdom authorities have made clear on a number of previous occasions, they have no means of preventing individual travel to Southern Rhodesia. Although where possible prospective participants in sporting events in Southern Rhodesia are warned of the likely consequences of their visits, no warning was possible in this case as the authorities had

no advance knowledge of Mr. Ahmad's intentions. There can be no doubt, however, that any sportsman resident in the United Kingdom is well aware of the opposition of the Government of the United Kingdom to sporting exchanges with Southern Rhodesia.

"The United Kingdom authorities have no evidence that Yunus Ahmad contravened exchange control regulations or any other domestic sanctions legislation."

8. The matter was considered at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the Committee decided that the case should be closed.

9. Subsequently, however, an acknowledgement dated 22 September 1976 was received from Australia, and replies previously due from them were received from Barbados and Australia, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 4 October 1976 from Barbados

"The Permanent Representative of Barbados to the United Nations ... with reference to his note of 11 March 1976 (Case No. 226), has the honour to transmit the following reply from the Government of Barbados."

- "1. The two nationals of Barbados who toured Southern Rhodesia in September 1975 as members of the International Wanderers cricket team are professional cricketers ordinarily domiciled in the United Kingdom and did not travel from Barbados to Southern Rhodesia.
- "2. The Government of Barbados has no knowledge of the banking, travel or other arrangements which permitted or facilitated the tour.
- "3. The Barbados Government's policy in respect of sportsmen who participate in sports in South Africa and other countries with racist régimes is one of disapproval and non-support of any such Barbadian or Barbadian sporting organization.
- "4. The Government of Barbados has never recognized or established any form of diplomatic or consular relations with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia."

(ii) Note dated 19 October 1976 from Australia

"The Permanent Representative of Australia has the honour to advise that Mohammad Ilyas acquired Australian citizenship in 1974. The Australian Government applies no restrictions on private travel overseas by Australian citizens and is unable to confirm whether or not Mr. Ilyas has visited Southern Rhodesia since becoming an Australian citizen.

"The Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations would appreciate the assistance of the Secretary-General in conveying the above information to the Security Council Committee."

(198) Case 228. Visit of Southern Rhodesian karate coach to France:
information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 France on 17 February 1976.
4. A reply dated 23 February 1976 was received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform him that, as soon as its attention had been drawn to the information contained in his note concerning Case No. 228, the French Government immediately ordered an investigation.

"After checking, the Secretariat of State for Youth and Sports was able to confirm that a karate coach from Southern Rhodesia had indeed visited France at the suggestion of a club. The National Karate Union was not approached or even warned.

"If the person concerned had entered France on a Rhodesian passport, he would have been turned back at the frontier, in accordance with the very strict orders which have been given. However, since he carried a non-Rhodesian passport, no measure could be taken against him and consequently no trace of his visit could be found by the French authorities. Nevertheless, in order to prevent a recurrence of such incidents, the Secretariat of State for Youth and Sports has just sent sports federations a circular reminding them of the provisions of resolution 253 and requesting them to ensure that they are strictly observed."

5. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(199) Case No. 229. Participation of Southern Rhodesian player in the
international tennis championships in Spain:
information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. First and second reminders were sent to Spain on 8 April and 10 May 1976 respectively.
4. A reply dated 9 June 1976 was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations ... with reference to his [the Secretary-General's] communications PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) concerning Case Nos. 229 and 258, dated 14 November 1975 and 30 April 1976 respectively, and the corresponding reminders, has the honour to inform him, on the instructions of his Government, that the competent Spanish authorities are conducting a thorough investigation of both cases and have also issued strict instructions to all national sports organizations to prevent situations such as those in question from recurring in the future.

"The Permanent Representative of Spain expects to be able to report to the Secretary-General shortly on the results of the aforementioned investigations so that they may be transmitted in due course to the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia."

5. A third reminder was sent to Spain on 28 June 1976.
6. A procedural question was raised by Spain in a note dated 29 June 1976, as to why it had been necessary to send a third reminder in view of the reply from that Government above dated 9 June 1976.
7. The Committee took note of the fact that the original note had been sent to Spain on 14 November 1975, followed by two reminders dated 8 April and 10 May 1976. Thereafter, Spain had sent the reply reproduced in paragraph 2 above, an acknowledgement affirming that the Spanish authorities were conducting a thorough investigation of this case and of Case No. 258. In accordance with the normal procedure, a third reminder had been sent to Spain on 28 June 1976. In the circumstances, an explanatory note dated 10 August 1976 was sent to Spain, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee has taken note of the procedural question raised in His Excellency's note of 29 June 1976 with regard to the dispatch of a third reminder to the Government of Spain in connexion with the above-mentioned case. The Committee believes that His Excellency will recall the procedural practice adopted by the Committee, as indicated in the Committee's eighth report (S/11927, para. 14), by which a third reminder is sent to Governments from which no substantive reply has been received to the Committee's inquiries.

"With regard to the present case, the Committee has expressed the hope that the Government of Spain will now be in a position to communicate to it the results of the investigations, the request for which was conveyed to the Government in the Secretary-General's note dated 14 November 1975."

8. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 28 September 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Spain announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case in connexion with which a reply was still pending after three reminders.
9. Before the meeting could be arranged a reply dated 25 October 1976, also bearing relation to Case No. 258, was received from Spain. The substantive part of that reply reads as follows.

"With reference to your communication of 28 September 1976 regarding Case No. 229 and further to what I communicated to you orally, I am pleased to inform you that my Government attaches great importance to co-operation with the Committee on sanctions in order that the latter may carry out the task entrusted to it by the Security Council concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia.

"In that connexion, I wish to remind you that since more than 32 million people visit Spain each year, it is materially impossible to maintain data on all visitors. Nevertheless, the Spanish authorities are continuing their investigations regarding the above-mentioned case, and those investigations could perhaps be facilitated if the Committee provided us with any information it may have obtained from the other countries in which the player Dowdeswell participated in tennis competitions."

10. In view of the above reply the Chairman felt that it was no longer necessary for him to hold the proposed meeting with the Permanent Representative of Spain.

11. Also bearing in mind the points raised in that reply, the Committee noted that the name of Colin Dowdeswell had again appeared in newspaper reports indicating that the tennis player in question continued to travel abroad to participate in international tennis tournaments. As such reports had been received after the 269th meeting, 1/ when the Committee decided to concentrate only on teams and sports activities of a nationally representative character, no new cases had been opened involving that player. No useful, additional information from other Governments could therefore be forwarded by the Committee to the Spanish authorities, as requested. Accordingly, a note to that effect dated 30 November 1976 was sent to Spain, under the no-objection procedure.

(200) Case No. 230. Participation of Southern Rhodesian in the commemorative Marathon in Greece: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 Greece on 26 January 1976.
4. A reply dated 4 February 1976 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 communicate that an investigation carried out by the competent Greek authorities has evidenced that no person under the name referred to in His Excellency's note, holding a Southern Rhodesian passport, arrived in Greece. It cannot, however, be excluded that the person in question might have been able to enter Greece under another name and holding a passport of another country. In this respect it should be noted that a

1/ See paras. 11 and 72-76 in vol. I of the present report.

group of tourists from southern Africa staged a so-called 'private Marathon' in Athens on 29 October 1975, of which the competent Greek authorities had no previous knowledge.

"Under the circumstances, this Mission feels that the item published in the Rhodesian press cannot be substantiated."

(201) Case No. 231. Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the Dewar Tennis Cup matches: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 13 January 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have looked into the question of the participation by two Southern Rhodesian tennis players in the Dewar Cup matches. They have now confirmed that both players were entered in their personal capacity and did not represent the illegal régime. Their expenses in the United Kingdom were met by the organizers of the tournament and there is no evidence of any infringement of British exchange control regulations.

"The opposition of the Government of the United Kingdom to such sporting exchanges is well known and efforts are continually made to dissuade organizers from proceeding with arrangements in this context. Under existing legislation, however, it is not possible to apply a formal ban.

"The United Kingdom authorities are still investigating the details of travel documents used by these tennis players but in the meantime wish to make it clear that concessionary British passport facilities are not extended for sporting visits."

4. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(202) Case No. 234. Visit of the American All-Stars College Basketball Team to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. The case was considered at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the representative of the United States made a statement in which he said that his delegation's reply was the same as that given in Case No. 216 (see para. 3 of (189) Case No. 216 above).

4. At the same meeting the Committee decided that the case should be kept open pending further information regarding the financial arrangements made in respect of the visiting team from the United States.

5. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement concerning several cases under consideration. The text of that part of the statement pertinent to this case is reproduced in paragraph 4 of (189) Case No. 216, above.

(203) Case No. 235. Participation of foreign jockeys in Salisbury's Plate Glass Jockey's International: information obtained from published sources

1. In December 1975 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which eight visiting riders from Australia, Canada, France, Ireland, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States had accepted invitations to participate in the Plate Glass Jockey's International held in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, in November 1975.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, notes were prepared for transmission to each of the Governments concerned, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that such participation in a sports event in Southern Rhodesia enhanced the position of the illegal régime there, and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee therefore requested the Government to investigate the circumstances of that participation, including, in particular, the banking, travel and other arrangements that had facilitated the travel of the rider concerned to and from Southern Rhodesia.

3. Meanwhile, at the 260th meeting on 22 December 1975 the representative of the United States made a statement, the text of which is reproduced as follows:

"I refer to the information from published sources circulated to the Committee on 9 December 1975 regarding the participation of foreign jockeys in Salisbury's Plate Glass Jockey's International. Appropriate inquiries have been made at the Department of State in Washington and it has been ascertained that any participation by individual United States jockeys was strictly on a private basis, involving no affiliation or United States Government sponsorship."

4. Consequently the proposed note was not sent to the United States. The note was, however, sent to Australia, Canada, France, Ireland and the United Kingdom on 26 December 1975.

5. Acknowledgements were received from Canada and Ireland on 2 and 6 January 1976, respectively.

6. Replies were received from Australia, the United Kingdom, Ireland and Canada, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 6 January 1976 from Australia

"The information contained in the Secretary-General's note has been referred to the appropriate authorities in Australia for investigation. The Secretary-General may be assured that a thorough investigation will be undertaken and appropriate action will follow if any evidence is found of any breach of the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"The Secretary-General will be aware of the opposition of the Australian Government to the pretensions of the illegal régime and of its strict adherence to the sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

"The results of the investigation of the information contained in the Secretary-General's note will be conveyed to the Secretary-General as soon as they are available."

(ii) Note dated 13 January 1976 from the United Kingdom (also covering Case No. 237)

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have looked into the questions of the acceptance by a British jockey of an invitation to ride in the Plate Glass Jockeys' International Race Meeting in Salisbury on 29 November 1975 and of the participation of several British tennis players in the Rhodesian Open Tennis Championships held in Salisbury in early December 1975. They have established that in both cases the British subjects concerned were involved in a purely private capacity and had no official or semi-official status.

"In neither case is there any evidence that exchange control regulations were infringed as expenses were met by the events' organisers in Southern Rhodesia.

"The opposition of the Government of the United Kingdom to such sporting exchanges is well known and where possible efforts are made to prevent the organisers from proceeding with their arrangements. In the absence of a total ban on travel to Rhodesia, however, the United Kingdom authorities are not in a position to prevent individuals from travelling to Rhodesia if that is their wish, although they take steps to warn prospective travellers of the consequences of their travel including lending support to the pretensions of the illegal régime and they try to ensure that sanctions regulations are not breached."

(iii) Note dated 22 January 1976 from Ireland

"The Permanent Representative of Ireland, on the instructions of his Government, has the honour to convey the following reply to the Secretary-General's note:

"The Government of Ireland are deeply conscious of their obligation under the Charter of the United Nations to give effect to binding decisions of the Security Council. Ireland has fully applied the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Council on Southern Rhodesia and will continue to do so.

"While the Irish Government have in the past taken and will continue to take whatever steps are open to them to discourage visits to Southern Rhodesia, they are not in a position to prevent private visits of the kind referred to in the Secretary-General's note.

"In so far as the present case is concerned, moreover, the individual in question is permanently employed and ordinarily resident outside of Ireland and is not registered as a practicing Irish jockey with the Irish racing authorities. In these circumstances, the Irish Government regret that they have been unable to ascertain precise details as to the arrangements made for travel to and from Southern Rhodesia. They have found no reason, however, to suggest that travel and other arrangements were effected in Ireland. Should any further information in the matter become available to the Irish Government, it will, of course, be conveyed to the Committee'."

(iv) Note dated 12 February 1976 from Canada

"The Permanent Mission of Canada wishes to advise the Secretary-General that the Canadian authorities have investigated and have ascertained that no Canadian Government funding was made available to enable the individual concerned to participate in the race in question. While the Canadian Government does not approve, encourage or support such contacts with or in Rhodesia, it is not prepared to interfere with the rights of Canadians to travel where they wish. The individual concerned appears to be a professional jockey who travelled to Rhodesia and participated in the event on his own initiative. The Canadian Government neither supported nor condones his action."

7. First and second reminders were sent to France on 13 February and 23 March 1976.

8. A reply dated 25 March 1976 has been received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform him the Secretary-General that the information circulated to the Committee on 9 December 1975 concerning Case No. 235 has been transmitted to the French Government for verification.

"The French Government will not fail on this occasion, as it has done in similar cases, to remind the competent sporting federations of its standing instructions concerning sports relations with Rhodesia."

9. Notes dated 16 August 1976 sent to Australia and France inquiring whether investigations of the matter had been concluded and the results could be communicated to the Committee.

10. A further acknowledgement dated 22 September 1976 to the Secretary-General's note of 26 December 1975 was received from Australia.

11. A second reminder was sent to Australia and a third reminder to France on 24 September 1976.

12. A reply dated 4 October 1976 was received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and has the honour to inform him that the information contained in his note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) concerning case No. 235 has been brought to the attention of the French Government. The Secretariat of State for Youth and Sports stated that this kind of activity had no official character. Nevertheless, it conveyed the request for verification to the Association to Promote the Improvement of Breeds of Horses in France.

"The directors of that Association replied that the jockey Rivases had indeed taken part in a race in Rhodesia. Participation in that race was by invitation, as is usually the case in that sort of competition. All expenses were borne by the racing association which issued the invitation. The Secretariat of State for Youth and Sports took the opportunity to remind the Association that such participation was contrary to the spirit and the intention of the provisions of Security Council resolution 253."

13. A third reminder was sent to Australia on 15 November 1976, which crossed with the reply from that Government dated 10 November 1976, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the latter's note of 26 December 1975 regarding Case No. 235. The Permanent Representative has the honour to advise that the Australian Government applies no restrictions on private travel overseas by Australian citizens and is, therefore, not able to know with any precision the intentions of its citizens travelling abroad.

"The Secretary-General will be aware, however, from note No. 114 k/ of the Permanent Representative of Australia that the Australian Government does not approve of sporting contacts, either direct or through international sports organizations, with Southern Rhodesia.

"The Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations would appreciate the assistance of the Secretary-General in conveying the above information to the Security Council Committee."

(204) Case No. 237. Participation of foreign sportsmen in Rhodesian Open Tennis Championships: information obtained from published sources

1. In December 1975 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which tennis players from France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States were at that time participating in the so-called Rhodesian Open Tennis Championships in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia.

k/ See para. 74 in vol. I of the present report.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, concerning sports events, notes were prepared for transmission to each of the Governments concerned, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that such participation in a sports event in Southern Rhodesia enhanced the position of the illegal régime there, and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee therefore requested the Government to investigate the circumstances of that participation, including, in particular, the banking, travel and other arrangements that had facilitated the travel of the tennis players concerned to and from Southern Rhodesia.

3. At the 264th meeting on 29 December 1975, the representative of the United States made a statement, the text of which is reproduced as follows:

"Appropriate inquiries by the Department of State have determined that whatever United States athletes may have participated in the Rhodesian Open Tennis Championships, referred to in /the information from published sources circulated to the Committee on 16 December 1975/, did so strictly in an individual capacity and had no affiliation with the United States Government."

4. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States. The note was, however, sent to France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom on 2 January 1976.

5. A reply dated 13 January 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 6 (ii) of (203) Case No. 235 above.

6. A reply dated 3 February 1976 was received from the Netherlands, drawing attention to the fact that the town in which, according to the newspaper report, the citizen from the Netherlands participated in a tennis competition was located in South Africa and not in Southern Rhodesia. That information was subsequently verified to be correct.

7. A first reminder was sent to France on 7 April 1976.

8. A reply dated 20 April 1976 was received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations ... with reference to /the Secretary-General's/ note, informs him that the French Government began an investigation as soon as the information concerning Case No. 237, on the possible participation of French athletes in the Rhodesian open tennis championships, was brought to its notice.

"On completing its inquiries, the Secretariat of State for Youth and Sports reported that it had no information enabling it to deny or confirm that a French tennis-player and his wife had actually taken part in a tournament in Rhodesia. These players could have gone to that territory only on their own responsibility. The French Tennis Federation had stated that it had not sent these players and that they therefore were not representing France.

"Nevertheless, and in order to prevent such incidents in future as far as possible, the French Tennis Federation has reminded its members of the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) concerning sanctions against Rhodesia."

(205) Case No. 240. Participation of a Southern Rhodesian in the World Championship Tennis tournament in the United States: information obtained from published sources

1. In January 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which Andrew Pattison, described as a Southern Rhodesian, had participated in the World Championship Tennis tournament at Columbus, Ohio, in the United States of America.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, concerning sports events, a note was prepared for transmission to the United States, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the participation of a Southern Rhodesian player in a sports event in the United States, which was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of a person ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia might have been in conflict with the provisions of those sanctions.
3. Meanwhile, a statement on the matter was submitted by the representative of the United States on 11 February 1976, the text of which is reproduced below:

"With reference to the information from published sources circulated to the Committee on 29 January 1976, the United States wishes to inform the Committee that Mr. Andrew Pattison, who was born in South Africa, was initially admitted to the United States in 1966, bearing a British passport. He has never played tennis in the United States for Rhodesia or on a Rhodesian national team. Further, Mr. Pattison became a permanent resident of the United States in May 1975."
4. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States.
5. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 29 April 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(206) Case No. 241. Participation of a United States citizen in the Southern Rhodesian Open Chess Championships: information obtained from published sources

1. In January 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a United States former college student on a world trip by bicycle ended up in Southern Rhodesia, where he participated in the so-called Rhodesian Open Chess Championships.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note was prepared for transmission to the United States, under

the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that such participation in a sports event in Southern Rhodesia enhanced the position of the illegal régime there, and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee, therefore, requested the Government to investigate the circumstances of that participation, including, in particular, the banking, travel, and other arrangements that had facilitated the travel of the individual concerned to and from Southern Rhodesia.

3. Meanwhile, a communication on the matter was submitted by the representative of the United States on 11 February 1976, the text of which is reproduced below:

"With reference to the information from published sources circulated to the Committee on 2 February 1976, the United States wishes to inform the Committee that if a United States citizen did in fact participate in the Rhodesian chess competition, he did so in a private capacity, without the knowledge of the United States Government, and without any official status. It is the policy of the United States Government, and will continue to be, to discourage travel to Southern Rhodesia."

4. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States.

5. The case was discussed at the 267th meeting on 28 April 1976, at which the representative of the United States made a statement in which he gave assurance that all investigative possibilities had been exhausted. The case had been opened on the basis of information obtained from a published source which had not named the individual in question. It was therefore very difficult to reconstruct the case and he doubted whether it would be possible to obtain any further information.

6. At the same meeting, the Committee decided that it should be considered as closed.

(207) Case No. 242. Southern Rhodesia and the International Sports Federations (ISF) 1/ Games: information obtained from published sources

1. In February 1972 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which the so-called Rhodesian Amateur Bodybuilding Association (RABA) was planning to compete in the World Championships of the International Sports Federations Games to be held in Philadelphia, United States of America, in

1/ General Assembly of International Sports Federations: Secretary-General - Oscar State, 4 Godfrey Avenue, Twickenham, United Kingdom; headquarters - 32 av du Léman, 1005 Lausanne, Switzerland; founded - 23 April 1967, Lausanne, Switzerland; aims - to promote and maintain authority and autonomy of the international federations; to promote closer links between them and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and other sports organizations; to convey to the IOC, the international federations and other organizations their views; structure - General Assembly, held prior to meetings of IOC; elects officers, council and four commissions; General Assembly meetings - 1971 Vienna, 1972 Lausanne, 1973 Oklahoma, 1974 Lausanne, 1975 Montreal.

September 1976. During the championships, the information further stated, RABA would make an application to the Games steering committee to stage the World Championships in September 1981.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, concerning sports events a note and a letter were prepared for transmission to the United States and to the Secretary-General of the General Assembly of the International Sports Federations, respectively, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the possibility of participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such an event was of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia would be in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions. The Committee would therefore appreciate receiving information as to the measures contemplated by the Government to ensure that mandatory sanctions of the Security Council were scrupulously enforced.

3. Meanwhile, a communication on the matter was submitted by the representative of the United States on 11 February 1976, the text of which is reproduced below:

"With reference to the information from published sources circulated to the Committee on 2 February 1976, the United States wishes to inform the Committee that we are unaware of any request by the so-called Rhodesian Amateur Bodybuilding Association to enter the United States for the purpose of participating in competition in Philadelphia. Should a Rhodesian team apply for a visa, such application will be denied, consistent with United States policy and adherence to United Nations sanctions."

4. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States. The proposed letter, the substantive text of which is reproduced below, was, however, sent by the Chairman of the Committee to the Secretary-General of ISF on 17 February 1976.

"At the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to draw your attention to information that has been obtained by the Committee from published sources, according to which the so-called Rhodesian Amateur Bodybuilding Association will make an application in Philadelphia (USA) in September 1976 to hold the 1981 World Games in Southern Rhodesia. A copy of the source of that information is herewith attached for ease of reference.

"The Committee, whose membership is the same as that of the Security Council, is entrusted by the Council with various duties in connexion with the application of the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee views with serious concern any action that might enhance the status of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or provide the possibility of a breach of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council against that régime.

"The Committee would be grateful if, in the event of such an application by the Rhodesian Amateur Bodybuilding Association for holding the 1981 World Games in Rhodesia, you were to bring this letter to the attention of your Executive, with the Committee's urgent request that the mandatory sanctions of the Security Council be strictly observed, both in letter and spirit, and that any such application be rejected.

"The Committee would appreciate it if you could also circulate this communication to the upcoming General Assembly of International Sports Federations."

5. A reply dated 25 February 1976 was received from the General Secretary of the International Weightlifting Federation, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Let me say straight away that the bid from Southern Rhodesia is quite new to me. There was no mention of this at the last Congress held by our Federation. If there is an official bid, the matter will be discussed by our Executive Council, before being submitted to the full Congress. At the meeting of the Executive Council full attention will be paid to the information contained in your letter.

"Regarding the bid for the 1981 World Games, as a member of the Steering Committee for these World Games, I can assure you that the bid will not be entertained in any serious manner whatsoever. The sum proposed by Rhodesia, i.e. three hundred thousand dollars is far from being sufficient for the cost of organization. Our Committee is dealing in terms of three or four million dollars. I am certain that Rhodesia cannot find a sum approaching this at all. Furthermore owing to the difficulty of bringing various international bodies and national teams to Rhodesia the proposition would not be considered at all. I also am familiar with facilities in Rhodesia and am quite sure that they do not have sufficient sports facilities to be able to host such a sporting event.

"These decisions will be taken before the meeting of the General Assembly of International Sports Federations, so there will be no point in placing it on their agenda."

(208) Case No. 244. Participation of Malawi in swimming association with Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In February 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which the former president of the so-called Rhodesia Amateur Swimming Association, Col. Don Grainger, had been re-elected President of the Confederation of African Amateur Swimming Associations (CAASA) at the confederation's second general meeting held in Malawi during the week-end of 10 January 1976. At that meeting, the information further stated, Mr. Harvey Jury of Malawi had been elected executive member of the confederation.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports cases, a note dated 24 February 1976 was sent to Malawi, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive text of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has received information from published sources to the effect that the Swimming Association of Malawi is a member of the Confederation of African Amateur Swimming Associations, which also includes the so-called Rhodesia Amateur Swimming Association. The information further states that the second general meeting of swimming associations was held in Malawi during the week-end of 10 January 1976, in which a delegation of the Rhodesia Amateur Swimming Association participated. A copy of the newspaper report is herewith attached for ease of reference.

"The Committee decided that the matter should be brought to the attention of the Government of Malawi for investigation. Should the information be confirmed, the co-operation of the Malawi Swimming Association with the Rhodesia Amateur Swimming Association would certainly be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, in particular, subparagraphs 5 (a) and (b) of resolution 253 (1968). The Committee considers that the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia might have been in conflict with those provisions. Moreover, any membership of a Rhodesian sport association in an international organization is likely to encourage further the illegal régime in its unlawful actions.

"The Committee would be grateful if His Excellency's Government could draw this matter to the attention of the swimming association under its jurisdiction and impress on it the seriousness of the matter.

"The Committee also indicated that it would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter at its earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

3. First, second and third reminders were sent to Malawi on 26 April, 16 June and 21 July 1976.
4. In the absence of a reply from Malawi within the prescribed period of two months the Committee included that Government in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 August 1976.
5. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 28 September 1976 was sent by the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Malawi, announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the case in connexion with which a reply was still pending.
6. Before the proposed meeting took place, a reply dated 4 October 1976, addressed to the Chairman, was received from the Permanent Representative of Malawi, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I am in possession of your recent communication dated 28 September last in which you refer to Case No. 244 about which you say that my Government has been addressed three times already and that you have had no response since then. I don't seem to have received two of the reminders you refer to.

"However, you will wish to know that in Malawi sports are controlled by the National Sports Council of Malawi, which is recognized by the Ministry of Sports and Culture. Therefore, as far as the National Sports Council is concerned, swimming as an organized sporting body has not been affiliated to it. Above all, I wish to draw attention to the fact that, constitutionally,

the title of 'President' in Malawi is reserved for the head of State and Government. Therefore, my Government is not aware of any organization whose leader is given that title. In short, the National Sports Council of Malawi and the Malawi Government could not be associated with the activities of an organization which they do not recognize."

7. In view of the reply above, the Chairman felt that it was no longer necessary to discuss this case during his proposed meeting with the Permanent Representative of Malawi.

(209) Case No. 248. Cypriot soccer players in Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In February 1976, the Committee received information from published sources to the effect that three Cypriot soccer players had joined a Southern Rhodesian soccer club in 1975 and that the Cyprus Football Association had been in contact, through correspondence, with the so-called National Football Association of Southern Rhodesia on matters concerning those players.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 15 March 1976 was sent to Cyprus under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern that, if the information thus received was confirmed, it would certainly be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council resolutions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. In that case, the Committee requested to be informed of the circumstances in which Cypriot soccer players were recruited to join a Southern Rhodesian soccer club and of any details regarding the travel, banking and arrangements used by them from Cyprus to Southern Rhodesia. The note further drew the Government's attention to the fact that the Committee, by its note of 1 April 1975 addressed to all Member States, had requested the Governments to alert the national football associations under their jurisdiction against efforts by Southern Rhodesia to regain its membership in the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA), and that, in a press release issued on 12 June 1975, the Committee had also appealed for severance of any relations with competitors and teams in Southern Rhodesia.

3. An acknowledgement dated 23 March 1976 was received from Cyprus, followed by a reply dated 18 May 1976, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"An investigation revealed that the Cyprus Football Association had no intention of collaboration with, or recognition of the 'National Football Association of Southern Rhodesia' nor did it do so.

"Upon becoming aware of the violations by the so-called National Football Association of Southern Rhodesia, i.e. the illegal registration of Cypriot players by the aforementioned association, the Cyprus F.A. took proper remedial measures and reiterated its position as to such violations.

"The Cyprus F.A. promulgated a circular dated 10 April 1976 to all Cyprus football clubs drawing their attention to a circular letter of 17 November 1975 concerning the sanctions imposed by the United Nations and FIFA against Southern Rhodesia and stated that any violation of the sanctions would result in final expulsion of the involved football club from the Association. It further requested to be informed of any football players who registered with football clubs in Southern Rhodesia. (See annex I attached hereto.)

"The Cyprus F.A. further sent a letter to the 'National Football Association of Southern Rhodesia', dated 19 September 1975 protesting this violation by the aforementioned association. A copy of this letter was sent to FIFA. No response has been received to this letter of protest.

"A second letter dated 8 April 1976 was sent to the General-Secretary of FIFA requesting that urgent action be taken to end the illegal actions of the above-mentioned association.

"From the information gleaned, it is apparent that the Cyprus F.A. did not intend to contravene, nor did it contravene the letter or spirit of the relevant resolutions providing sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia."

Text of the enclosure

"Ref: 232

10 April 1976

"To all
Cyprus football clubs,

"We wish to refer to our circular letter No. 210 of 17 November 1975 concerning the sanctions imposed by the United Nations and FIFA against Southern Rhodesia and to draw your attention to the fact that any violation of these sanctions by any football club or football player will result in the final expulsion of the involved football club from the Cyprus Football Association.

"You are requested to communicate the above to all your football players and to inform us immediately, who of your football players are now in Rhodesia registered with football clubs there.

"Yours,

"(Ivikos Vorkas) (Christodoulos Hadjioannou)
President General Secretary

"Copy to: Cyprus Athletic Organisation."

(210) Case No. 249: Participation of a Southern Rhodesian yachtsman in Rio race: information obtained from published sources

1. In February 1976, the Committee obtained information from published sources to the effect that a Southern Rhodesian yachtsman participated in the Rio race, in Brazil, at the beginning of 1976.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, a note dated 23 March 1976 was sent to Brazil, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also stated that, should the information be correct, such activity would certainly be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. In that case, the Committee requested to be informed of the circumstances in which the yachtsman from Southern Rhodesia was admitted into Brazil, his full name and the travel documents used by him.

3. A first reminder was sent to Brazil on 24 May 1976.

4. A reply dated 3 June 1976 was received from Brazil, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent Brazilian authorities have been able to ascertain that Mr. Thomas Duncan Addison was registered, in Rio de Janeiro, as Captain of the vessel Gwen, port of inscription Capetown, and participated as a British citizen in an international sail race which took place last January, having presented, as proof of identity, British passport C740448."

(211) Case No. 251. Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the British Women's Open Squash Championships: information obtained from published sources

1. In March 1976 the Committee received information from published sources according to which Southern Rhodesian squash players had taken part in the Women's Open Squash Championships in London during the second part of February 1976.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, concerning sports events, a note dated 6 April 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern that, if the information thus received was confirmed, such participation would certainly be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council resolutions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. In that case, the Committee requested to be informed of the circumstances in which the squash players in question had been admitted into the United Kingdom, of the travel documents used by them and of the banking and other arrangements undertaken to facilitate their participation in the championships.

3. A reply dated 20 April 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Committee will be aware from previous notes that the United Kingdom authorities lack the power to prevent residents of Southern Rhodesia from competing as individuals in sporting events in the United Kingdom. Furthermore, in this case the authorities did not have advance notice of the participation of Mrs. Paton or Miss Haig.

"The United Kingdom authorities have no evidence that either Mrs. Paton or Miss Haig contravened exchange control regulations, or any other domestic sanctions legislation."

(212) Case No. 252. English cricket team visit to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In March 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which the Swallows, an English cricket team formed specifically for touring southern Africa, had arrived in Southern Rhodesia on 5 March 1976, where they were scheduled to play with several Rhodesian cricket clubs.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 6 April 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and

requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that such activity enhanced the position of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee therefore requested the Government to investigate the circumstances of that visit, including, in particular, the banking, travel and other arrangements that had facilitated the travel of the team to and from Southern Rhodesia.

3. A reply dated 20 April 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Committee will be well aware of the opposition of the Government of the United Kingdom to visits to Southern Rhodesia by United Kingdom sporting teams.

"The Committee will also be well aware of the policy of the Government of the United Kingdom in warning prospective participants, when possible, of the likely consequences of their visits. Even when, as in this case, the competent authorities had no advance warning of the visit and so no warning was possible, there can be no doubt of the fact that sportsmen resident in the United Kingdom are fully cognizant of the views of the Government of the United Kingdom concerning sporting exchanges with Southern Rhodesia.

"The United Kingdom authorities have no evidence that the Swallows contravened exchange control regulations or any domestic sanctions legislation."

(213) Case No. 253. Participation of Southern Rhodesians in the World Amateur Team Golf Championships in Portugal: information obtained from published sources

1. In March 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a Southern Rhodesian women's golf team was preparing to participate in the World Amateur Team Golf Championships to be held in Portugal in October 1976.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 6 April 1976 was sent to Portugal, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information, and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the possibility of participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such an event was of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia would be in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions.

3. In May 1976 the Committee received further information from published sources according to which a men's team of Southern Rhodesian golfers was also preparing to participate in the same championships in Portugal.

4. Similarly, a note dated 25 May 1976, enclosing a copy of the source of

information, was sent to Portugal, under the no-objection procedure, stating the Committee's position as indicated in paragraph 2 above.

5. A first reminder was sent to Portugal on 26 July 1976.
6. A copy of a letter dated 5 August 1976, addressed to the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations was forwarded to the Committee by the Halt All Racist Tours organization (HART), a non-governmental organization in New Zealand. The substantive part of the letter reads as follows:

"It has come to our attention that Portugal will be hosting the World Amateur Golf Championships later this year. At one stage it had been intended that New Zealand would host the tournament, but because the international golfing authorities insisted on all members of the World Golf Association being invited to compete, New Zealand had to forego the tournament. This was because Southern Rhodesia is a member of the World Golfing Association (WGA), and under New Zealand law it would be illegal to allow a team from Southern Rhodesia to enter the country. The mandatory clauses of United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Southern Rhodesia have been incorporated into New Zealand law.

"We bring this matter to your attention, for we believe that were Portugal to allow the Southern Rhodesian golf team to enter Portugal, it would be defying United Nations Security Council resolutions. It would also be doing something that practically no other country in the world would allow, for most countries have incorporated the mandatory aspects of the resolutions into their own law.

"We would respectfully request that the Portuguese Government refuse to allow a team from the illegal Southern Rhodesian régime to enter Portugal to compete in the tournament. Such an action would be in accordance with Security Council resolutions, in defense of the international boycott against Southern Rhodesia, and additionally, it would serve to show the WGA that it cannot continually make such absurd stipulations as it has, i.e. Southern Rhodesia must be admitted to the tournament or you will not have the tournament. The WGA must come into the real world."

7. A second reminder was sent to Portugal on 27 August 1976.
8. An acknowledgement was sent to HART on 31 August 1976.
9. A third reminder was sent to Portugal on 28 September 1976.
10. In the absence of a reply from Portugal within the prescribed period of two months, the Committee included that Government in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

(214) Case No. 254. Visit of the Gloucestershire Rugby team to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In April 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which the Gloucestershire Rugby team from the United Kingdom was going to visit Southern Rhodesia at the end of May 1976. The information also

indicated that the United Kingdom authorities had already taken preliminary steps to try to stop the visit to Southern Rhodesia, of which the Committee had taken due note.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, a note dated 13 April 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern that such a visit, if it took place, would certainly be considered contrary to both the spirit and intent of Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. In that case the Committee wished to be informed of any measures contemplated by the United Kingdom authorities to prevent the reported visit from taking place.

3. A reply dated 10 May 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have confirmed the accuracy of reports in the Southern Rhodesian press both as to the intention of the Gloucestershire Rugby team to play a match in Salisbury on 29 May 1976 and as to the efforts which have been made by the Government of the United Kingdom to persuade them to cancel this fixture.

"On 12 February 1976 the United Kingdom Minister for Sport, the Right Honourable Denis Howell MP, wrote to the Secretary of the Rugby Football Union, Air Commodore R. H. G. Weighill, reminding him of the Government's stated policy that sporting contacts with Southern Rhodesia are wrong and asking him to ensure that the Gloucestershire Rugby Football Club were fully aware of this policy. Mr. Howell further pointed out that there was a serious risk that the Southern Rhodesians might try to misrepresent the team's visit for propaganda purposes. Air Commodore Weighill replied on 17 February that he was forwarding a copy of the Minister's letter to Gloucestershire RFC with a covering letter making it very clear that the Rugby Football Union supports the view of the Government of the United Kingdom. Further representations were made by the Minister for Sport, pointing out the physical dangers inherent in any visit to Rhodesia in the present political climate.

"The Government of the United Kingdom regrets that these efforts have not been successful in persuading Gloucestershire Rugby Football Club to cancel their proposed match in Salisbury and the Committee will be aware that the visit per se is not in contravention of sanctions legislation."

(215) Case No. 255. Participation of a baseball team from the United States in the test series against Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In March 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a baseball team from the United States known as the American Eagles had taken part in a three-test series against Southern Rhodesia at the end of February 1976.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning

sports events, a note was prepared for transmission to the United States, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at such an activity which was certainly considered contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council provisions establishing sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. The Committee would, therefore, welcome information on the banking, travel and other arrangements that had been made to permit or facilitate the travel of the baseball team in question to Southern Rhodesia and participate in the test series there.

3. Meanwhile, a communication on the matter was received from the representative of the United States on 26 March 1976, the text of which is reproduced below.

"With reference to [the information from published sources circulated to the Committee on 19 March 1976] I am able to report that following the appropriate inquiries, the United States Government has determined that the team in question, the American Eagles, is a private team, with no affiliation with the United States Government and no official capacity. Their visit to Southern Rhodesia was of a strictly private nature."

4. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States.

(216) Case No. 257. English boys' hockey team tour to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In April 1976, the Committee obtained information from published sources to the effect that the English Dragons hockey team was planning to travel to Southern Rhodesia in July 1976 and play several matches there, including one against a so-called National Colts XI.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 30 April 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern that, if the information thus received was confirmed, such activity would certainly be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council provisions establishing sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia.

3. A reply dated 2 June 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The United Kingdom authorities have been in correspondence with both the English Schoolboys' Hockey Association and the organizer of the Dragons' proposed tour to Southern Rhodesia. The Association has replied to the effect that they would certainly not themselves envisage such a tour against Government advice; as the Dragons' organizer is unconnected with the Association, however, their approval in this case has not been sought nor is it required. The results of the representations made to the tour organizer are still awaited and will be communicated to the Committee in due course."

4. A further reply dated 23 September 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The United Kingdom Minister for Sport, the Right Honourable Denis Howell MP, communicated personally on several occasions with the organizers of the Dragons' tour but his efforts were not successful in bringing about the cancellation of the visit. Her Majesty's Government naturally regrets this outcome but the Committee will be aware that the visit per se was not in contravention of sanctions legislation."

(217) Case No. 258. Participation of Southern Rhodesian in the Valencia (Spain) international tennis tournament: information obtained from published sources

1. In April 1976, the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a Southern Rhodesian player named Colin Dowdeswell had taken part in the Valencia (Spain) international tennis tournament, held in March 1976.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 30 April 1976 was sent to Spain, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting the Government to undertake the necessary investigations so as to determine, and inform the Committee of, the circumstances in which the tennis player in question was admitted into Spain, the travel documents used by him, as well as the banking and other arrangements undertaken to facilitate his participation in the Valencia international tennis tournament.
3. A reply dated 9 June 1976 was received from Spain, for the substantive part of which see paragraph 2 of (199) Case No. 229, above.
4. A note dated 16 August 1976 was sent to Spain, inquiring whether the investigations undertaken by the Spanish authorities were complete and the results could be communicated to the Committee.
5. A second reminder was sent to Spain on 28 September 1976.
6. For additional information concerning the action taken on the case, see paragraphs 6 to 9 of (199) Case No. 229 above.

(218) Case No. 260. Southern Rhodesian women's team and the Philadelphia Federation Cup international tennis tournament: information obtained from published sources

1. In April 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a Southern Rhodesian women's team had applied to take part in the Philadelphia Federation Cup international tennis tournament to be held in Philadelphia, United States, in August 1976.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note was prepared for transmission to the United States, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the possibility of such participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such participation was of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against

Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia would be in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions. It would therefore welcome information of any action that the Government contemplated taking to prevent the Southern Rhodesian team from entering the United States and participating in the tournament there.

3. Meanwhile, at the 267th meeting on 28 April 1976, the representative of the United States informed the Committee that the United States Government had issued no visas to Southern Rhodesian nationals to participate in the Federation Cup and that, moreover, it had no intention of doing so.

4. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States.

5. In July 1976 the Committee received further information from published sources according to which the women's tennis team from Southern Rhodesia was one of the 28 national teams directly accepted to compete in the Federation Cup international tennis tournament to be held in Philadelphia from 22-29 August 1976. It was reported that Southern Rhodesia had been drawn against Belgium in the first round.

6. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a further note was prepared for transmission to the United States and a new note for transmission to Belgium, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon.

7. Meanwhile, at the 275th meeting on 16 July 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement on the matter in which he informed the Committee that the United States visa issuing authorities had been alerted to the possibility of Southern Rhodesians requesting visas for the [tennis] championships [in Philadelphia] and had been instructed not to issue passports to such applicants.

8. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States. The note was, however, sent to Belgium on 28 July 1976.

9. In August 1976 the Committee received further information from published sources, according to which members of the Southern Rhodesian team, using Netherlands or South African passports, had arrived in Philadelphia and were preparing to start their tournament programme on 24 August 1976. A news report was also received from the American Committee on Africa, a non-governmental organization in the United States, confirming the above information and also detailing the action taken by that organization to promote the rescission of the invitations to Southern Rhodesia [and South Africa] to participate in the tournament.

10. At the 282nd meeting on 9 December 1976 the representative of the United States made a statement on the matter, the text of which is reproduced below.

"Following receipt of information that several Rhodesian nationals intended to enter the US to compete in the Federation Cup tennis tournament in Philadelphia in August, the US Department of State issued a world-wide visa alert to US embassies and consulates to intercept any application by the members of the Rhodesian team. Because of communications problems and because the members of the team fraudulently concealed their real intentions

in coming to the US, they were issued visas on British, South African and Dutch passports in Johannesburg. The team members failed to mention in their visa interviews that they were coming to play tennis in the US for Rhodesia, or that they would in some manner represent Rhodesia. Since the US, in compliance with United Nations sanctions, does not permit Rhodesians to represent that territory in sporting events in the US, we would have denied their visas if we had known the real reasons for their coming to the US, or if we had knowledge that in any manner their activities within Rhodesia or those proposed for themselves in the US would serve to aid or further the maintenance of the illegal Smith régime.

"Upon learning of their arrival in the US and their participation in the Federation Cup tennis tournament, the US Government launched an immediate investigation. Officials of the US Immigration and Naturalization Service interviewed the team members in Philadelphia on 26 August. Based on the information furnished by the team members and our Consulate General in Johannesburg, the Department of State determined preliminarily that the team members had misrepresented themselves in applying for visas in violation of US law. Before the investigation could be completed and further action taken, under our laws, the team members departed the US.

"The US Government regrets that the members of the Rhodesian tennis team were able to evade our enforcement of sanctions in this particular case. We have taken steps to assure that this situation is not repeated in the future."

11. A first reminder was sent to Belgium on 15 December 1976.

12. In the absence of a reply from Belgium within the prescribed period of two months, the Committee included that Government in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

(219) Case No. 264. Southern Rhodesia and the world championships of bodybuilders in Canada: information obtained from published sources

1. In May 1976, the Committee received information from published sources to the effect that the so-called Southern Rhodesia Bodybuilding Federation has received an official invitation for two delegates and a team of three bodybuilders to participate in the World Championships and Congress of the International Federation of Bodybuilders in Montreal, Canada, from 4-7 November 1976.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 25 May 1976 was sent to Canada, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that should the information be confirmed, the participation of a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such an event was of a representational nature, would be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. In that case, the Committee requested to be informed of any action that the Government of Canada contemplated taking to prevent the Southern Rhodesian team or delegation from entering Canada and participating in the World Championships and Congress of the International Federation of Bodybuilders.

3. An acknowledgement dated 3 June 1976 was received from Canada, followed by a reply dated 16 June 1976, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Canadian authorities concerned appreciate the notice given by the Sanctions Committee and would be grateful for any additional information that may become available in future which would be of assistance and interest to them.

"In order to fully enforce the measures relating to international travel of Rhodesians upon which the Security Council decided in resolution 253 of 29 May 1968, the Canadian Government has recently effected new regulations requiring visas for all residents of Rhodesia, regardless of whether they travel on Rhodesian or other countries' travel documents. The criteria used for deciding whether or not a visa should be granted are those outlined in paragraph 5 of resolution 253 (1968).

"The policies and guidelines that have been established for the enforcement of these regulations are such that it is extremely unlikely that visas would be approved for any Rhodesian wishing to come to Canada for the purpose of participating in the World Championships and Congress of the International Federation of Bodybuilders. Nonetheless, any further information the Sanctions Committee may obtain in this regard would be of assistance and interest to the Canadian authorities."

(220) Case No. 268. Junior golf team from the United States tour of Southern Rhodesia in 1977: information obtained from published sources

1. In May 1976 the Committee obtained information from published sources, according to which a team of six junior golfers from the United States were planning to tour Southern Rhodesia in 1977.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note was prepared for transmission to the United States, under the no-objection procedure, enclosing a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at such participation of a team of golfers from the United States in sports activities in Southern Rhodesia, which would be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in that Territory. In that case, the Committee would appreciate information of any action that the United States Government contemplated taking to prevent the team from undertaking the proposed tour of Southern Rhodesia.
3. Meanwhile, at the 270th meeting on 27 May 1976, the representative of the United States, informed the Committee that his delegation had received information from the United States State Department, according to which, first of all, the players on that team would have to make the tour as private individuals. Furthermore, the United States Government was not responsible either for the organization or the financing of that tour. Lastly, that, as the United States delegation had indicated before, m/ the Government of the United States had given instructions to its

m/ See para. 6 of Case No. INGO-11 in annex V, below.

embassies and consulates throughout the world, requesting them to advise United States citizens against going to Southern Rhodesia. Nevertheless, the United States Government could not prevent its nationals from going where they saw fit.

4. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to the United States.

(221) Case No. 271. Participation of two Southern Rhodesian soccer players in the 1977 Greek soccer season: information obtained from published sources

1. In August 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which two Southern Rhodesian soccer players had taken part in some matches with Greek professional teams in July 1976 and were scheduled to sign contracts with the Irri Football Club at the end of the year for the 1977 Greek soccer season.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, concerning sports events, a note dated 31 August 1976 was sent to Greece, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information, and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at participation by persons from Southern Rhodesia in sports activities abroad, which was considered contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee felt that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia might have been in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions and wished to know what measures the Government contemplated taking to prevent the two players from participating in the 1977 Greek soccer season.

3. A first reminder was sent to that Government on 3 November 1976.

4. A reply dated 15 November 1976 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 communicate the following:

"1. The Greek Soccer Confederation has confirmed, after thorough investigation, that the two soccer players mentioned in the article of Chronicle of 4 August 1976 have never been enlisted in any of the athletic associations members of the Confederation.

"2. There is no officially recognized athletic association in Greece under the title 'IRRI' FC.

"On this occasion, the Permanent Representative of Greece wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Greek competent authorities have once more issued instructions to all athletic associations of the country to avoid any contact with Rhodesian athletes or athletic associations."

(222) Case No. 277. Visit of a Uruguayan polo team to Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In July 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a Uruguayan polo team had visited Southern Rhodesia and played matches there during that month against the so-called Rhodesian B team.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 4 August 1976 was sent to Uruguay transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that such participation in sports events in Southern Rhodesia enhanced the position of the illegal régime there, and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee therefore requested the Government to investigate the circumstances of that visit, including, in particular, the banking, travel and other arrangements that facilitated the travel of the team to and from Southern Rhodesia.

3. A first reminder was sent to that Government on 5 October 1976.

4. A reply dated 25 October 1976 addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations was received from the Permanent Representative of Uruguay, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1), in which my Government is asked for information concerning the visit to Southern Rhodesia of a Uruguayan polo team.

"I wish to state in this regard that appropriate steps have been taken to clarify the situation and that I am in a position to inform you of the following:

"(1) The so-called Uruguayan team which performed in Southern Rhodesia was not in any sense representing the Uruguayan Polo Association even though it included two Uruguayan nationals.

"(2) The Uruguayan players in question were invited on a purely personal basis to play a number of matches in Rhodesia as part of a team which included players of two other nationalities.

"(3) There was at no time any formal contact between the Uruguayan and Rhodesian polo authorities.

"(4) As far as sports in general are concerned, my Government has taken the lead in promoting United Nations resolutions designed to eliminate segregation in sporting events even though in some cases, where unofficial sports organizations and federations not registered with the National Olympic Committee are involved, it is difficult for the authorities of a free and democratic country to control and direct their activities.

"I also wish to reaffirm once again my Government's traditional policy of strict compliance with the Security Council resolutions on the question of Rhodesia."

(223) Case No. 278. Participation of Southern Rhodesia in the 1977 Davis Cup tennis tournament: information obtained from published sources

1. In August 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which Southern Rhodesia was scheduled to play against Switzerland in the second round of the 1977 European zone A section of the Davis Cup tennis tournament.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 16 August 1976 was sent to Switzerland, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at such participation by Southern Rhodesia, which would certainly be considered contrary both to the spirit and intent of Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in that Territory.

3. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 16 October 1976.

4. A reply dated 21 October 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In the first of its communications, the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) expressed the hope that the Swiss Government could exert influence on the Swiss delegation to the annual general meeting of the Davis Cup Association so as to ensure that the question of expelling the Rhodesian Tennis Association was duly brought up and that the desired result, that is to say, its expulsion, was achieved.

"The Federal authorities have carefully considered the Committee's request. It is their regular practice to refrain from any intervention in matters lying within the competence of private sports associations. However, they have made a point of bringing the Committee's request to the attention of the Swiss Tennis Association.

"As to the Davis Cup match in which it took part with the Rhodesian Tennis Association, which is the subject of the note of 16 August, the Swiss Tennis Association has informed the Federal authorities that its decision was prompted by the fact that the Rhodesian Association is still a member in good standing of the International Tennis Association and of the 'Davis Cup Nations'."

(224) Case No. 279. Participation of an Australian team in the international squash tournament in Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. In August 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which an Australian team was planning to participate in the international squash tournament in Southern Rhodesia to be held at the end of that month.

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting concerning sports events, a note dated 15 September 1976 was sent to Australia, transmitting a copy of the source of the information and requesting comments thereon. The note also drew the Government's attention to the fact that such participation in sports events in Southern Rhodesia enhanced the position of the illegal régime there, and was, in the Committee's view, contrary to the spirit and intent of Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions against that régime; the Committee therefore requested the Government to investigate the circumstances of that participation including, in particular, the banking, travel and other arrangements that facilitated the travel of the team to and from Southern Rhodesia.

3. An acknowledgement dated 22 September 1976 was received from Australia.

4. A first reminder was sent to that Government on 15 November 1976.
5. A reply dated 18 November 1976 was received from Australia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the /Secretary-General's/ note of 15 September 1976 ... and to advise that the Australian Government applies no restrictions on private travel overseas by Australian citizens and is, therefore, not able to know with any precision the intentions of its citizens travelling abroad.

"The Secretary-General will be aware, however, from note No. 114 n/ of the Permanent Representative of Australia that the Australian Government does not approve of sporting contacts, either direct or through international sports organizations, with Southern Rhodesia.

"The Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations would appreciate the assistance of the Secretary-General in conveying the above information to the Security Council Committee."

(225) Case No. 280. Participation of a Southern Rhodesian team in the world combat pistol championships in Salzburg, Austria: information obtained from published sources

1. In August 1976 the Committee received information from published sources, according to which a team of players from Southern Rhodesia had participated in the second world combat shooting championships in Salzburg, Austria, during the week-end of 7 August 1976, and had won the team event of the championships and taken third place in the individual event.
2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 244th meeting, concerning sports events, a note dated 22 September 1976 was sent to Canada, under the no-objection procedure, transmitting a copy of the source of the information, and requesting comments thereon. The note also expressed the Committee's concern at the participation by a Southern Rhodesian team in a sports event abroad, particularly if such an event was of a representative nature, which would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; the Committee considered that in such circumstances the admission of persons ordinarily resident in Southern Rhodesia might have been in conflict with the provisions establishing those sanctions. The Committee would therefore welcome information on the circumstances in which the team from Southern Rhodesia had been admitted into Austria, what travel documents had been used by the sportsmen and what transport facilities had been made available to them.
3. A first reminder was sent to Austria on 24 November 1976.
4. A reply dated 1 December 1976 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

n/ See para. 74 in Vol. I of the present report.

"The Austrian authorities have, in conformity with the relevant requests of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, repeatedly appealed to Austrian sports associations to refrain from organizing sports events with participation of Southern Rhodesian individuals or groups, particularly if such individuals or groups would appear in a representative capacity. This appeal is being heeded by most Austrian sports associations.

"The Austrian authorities have, however, no legal means to prohibit or sanction the organization or hosting of sports events by persons under their jurisdiction on the grounds that nationals of certain other countries are participating.

"According to Austrian legal provisions Southern Rhodesian passports are not recognized as valid travel documents. The issue of visas into Southern Rhodesia passports for entry into Austria is prohibited. Entry into Austria by a person holding such a passport is thus not granted.

"As the investigations following the Committee's note of 22 September 1976 revealed, the Southern Rhodesian participants in the event in case entered Austria with valid passports of other countries, particularly the United Kingdom, for which no visas are required.

"Furthermore, as these investigations revealed, the participants did not enter Austria as a group but as individual travellers.

"Due to the great number of foreigners entering Austria usually for touristic purposes - several millions every year - Austrian border authorities cannot, for all practical purposes and in each case, determine ordinary residence of a foreigner holding a valid travel document. It is thus practically impossible to effectively prevent the entry of persons resident in Southern Rhodesia but holding other passports.

"For the same reason it could not be determined what transport facilities were used by the Southern Rhodesian participants when entering Austria. However, no transport facilities were made available to them by the Austrian authorities.

"Finally there exists no international association of combat pistol shooting. Therefore, the so-called 'world combat pistol championship' hosted by an Austrian sports club was not an international championship in the proper sense but merely thus titled by that sports club. It enjoyed no support whatsoever by the Austrian authorities."

M. BANKING, INSURANCE AND OTHER RELATED FACILITIES

(226) Case No. 163. Swiss company loan to Rhodesia Railways: United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1974

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information concerning the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 269th meeting, a note dated 9 June 1976 was sent to Switzerland under the no-objection procedure, inquiring as to exactly what form the investigations conducted by the Federal Authorities into the granting of a loan to Southern Rhodesia by a Swiss company (Industrie-Maschinen of Zurich) had taken; requesting a formal assurance that the company in question had not made a loan of exactly or approximately \$6 million during 1973-1974 to anyone, and, if it had done so, requesting information as to whom such a loan had been made.
4. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 16 August 1976.
5. A reply dated 27 August 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to his notes of 9 June and 16 August 1976, in which the Secretary-General informed him that the Security Council Committee wished to obtain clarification regarding the type of inquiry carried out by the Federal authorities in connexion with Case No. 163 (Industrie-Maschinen Zürich AG).

"In a note dated 25 September 1974, the Observer informed the Secretary-General, for the benefit of the sanctions Committee, that, within the framework of the legal means available to them, the competent Federal authorities had in this connexion interviewed Mr. Egli, President of the Board of Directors and owner of the company Industrie-Maschinen Zürich AG. On that occasion, Mr. Egli gave them formal assurances that the company had never agreed to, nor was in any way prepared to make, a loan of \$6 million or thereabouts to Rhodesia.

"In the absence of new and specific information or evidence, the Federal authorities are unable to reopen their investigation. When there has been no violation of Swiss legislation, their possibilities of intervention are very limited and they can only take note of the explanations provided to them voluntarily by the parties concerned. As in the past, the Federal authorities remain prepared to carry out a further investigation into the case if the sanctions Committee is able to be more specific about the questions which interest it."

6. The matter was considered at the 281st meeting, at which the Committee decided that a further note should be sent to Switzerland, requesting that Government to obtain specific assurance as to whether the Swiss company concerned had not, at the material time, given a loan of about \$US 6 million to anyone, not necessarily a Southern Rhodesian, as the Committee wished to remain in no doubt that no third party or intermediary might have possibly acted on behalf of a final Southern Rhodesian recipient of the loan.

7. At the time of the preparation of the present report action on the Committee's decision was under way.

(227) Case No. 171. Rhodesian Iron and Steel Corporation (RISCO): information obtained from published sources

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

2. Additional information obtained since the submission of that report is given below:

3. By a letter dated 23 January 1976 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. James Niddrie, o/ an individual living in Scotland, United Kingdom, renewed his request to the Committee for any assistance it might be able to give to secure the release of his brother-in-law, Mr. Kenneth McIntosh, o/ from prison in Southern Rhodesia.

4. In a statement to the Committee at the 272nd meeting on 10 June 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom, responding to a request made at a previous meeting for information concerning Mr. Kenneth McIntosh, said that Mr. McIntosh had escaped from prison in Salisbury on 4 February 1975. He had remained in hiding in a flat in Salisbury until 21 February, when he had managed to reach Vila Manica, a town in Mozambique near the Rhodesian border. He had arrived at Vila Manica at 4 p.m. on 21 February and had telephoned the British Consul in Beira at 7 a.m. on 22 February. The Consul had immediately telephoned the Portuguese authorities in Vila Manica and had received an assurance that Mr. McIntosh would not be returned to Rhodesia. He had then driven 180 miles from Beira and had arrived in Vila Manica at 12.15 p.m. Meanwhile, however, the Rhodesians had persuaded the local authorities to return Mr. McIntosh to them and had left with him around noon. The British authorities had ascertained that the case had been investigated at the local level and that Mr. McIntosh had been mistakenly returned to the Rhodesian authorities by the local Mozambican authorities, which, despite the British Consul's telephone call, had been led to believe that Mr. McIntosh was an escaped Rhodesian citizen. Mr. McIntosh had been returned to prison in Salisbury and had been given an additional two-year sentence, of which one year had been suspended. He was still in prison.

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 269th meeting, notes dated 10 June were sent to Austria and Switzerland and letters dated 17 June 1976 were sent by the Chairman to the International Pig Iron Secretariat and to Mr. James Niddrie, all under the no-objection procedure. The substantive parts of the notes and letters are reproduced below:

(i) Note to Austria

"The Committee took note that the Federal Government of Austria had no objections to hear the testimony of the witness named by the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, on the participation by the Austrian company,

o/ For background information concerning Messrs. James Niddrie and Kenneth McIntosh, see annex I to the Committee's special report on RISCO, submitted to the Security Council on 15 January 1975 (Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Special Supplement No. 3 (S/11597)).

VOEST, in the RISCO project, and that the competent Austrian authorities would shortly establish the necessary contact with him. He also noted that the Austrian authorities categorically rejected the allegations put forth in the communication dated 24 November 1975 from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions to the effect that an extensive cover-up operation was being organized within VOEST concerning its former participation in the RISCO project and that potential witnesses were being threatened by the management and that there was reason to suspect a breach of confidence.

"The Committee would be grateful to know whether the competent Austrian authorities have yet established the necessary contact with the witness in question and received from the witness, either orally or in writing, the details of the case as they were known to him.

"In accordance with the Committee's request, the Secretary-General would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter at its earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

(ii) Note to Switzerland

"The Committee would be grateful to know whether the Swiss authorities are yet able to inform it of the results of the investigations which were set in train by the Federal authorities in connexion with the documents concerning the inquiries carried out in Bermuda regarding the possible participation of European American Finance (Bermuda), Ltd., in the RISCO case.

"In accordance with the Committee's request, the Secretary-General would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter at its earliest convenience."

(iii) Letter from the Chairman of the Committee to the International Pig Iron Association

"On instructions of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, by a note dated 4 September 1975 I had the honour to bring to your attention certain information received by the Committee at that time concerning the possibility of participation by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Company (RISCO), through its membership of the International Pig Iron Secretariat, in a joint research project. According to that information the European Coal and Steel Community Technical Research Committee had approved a grant of about £20,000 towards a research project that would have been undertaken jointly by RISCO, the British Pig Iron Group and their counterparts in Finland, France, Italy, Norway and Sweden. Subsequent representations at different levels had resulted in cancellation of the research contract to that group and its award, instead, to another consortium that excluded RISCO.

"Nevertheless the Committee had felt that it should address itself to the International Secretariat with regard to RISCO membership in that organization. The Committee continues to consider that such membership might be exploited to enhance the position of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and that participation of RISCO, or any other organ of the régime, in such international economic activity is, in any case, contrary to the Security Council sanctions against that régime.

"The Committee had expressed great disappointment at the information that RISCO continued to be a member of the International Pig Iron Group and had therefore requested from the Group comments on the circumstances of that membership, as well as information on the measures contemplated by the constituent members of the organization to ensure the expulsion of RISCO therefrom.

"The Committee requested its Chairman to remind the International Pig Iron Association that it awaited information as to whether RISCO has yet been excluded from membership in the Association.

"The Committee also indicated its desire to receive, at the earliest convenience the organization's comments on this matter."

(iv) Letter from the Chairman of the Committee to Mr. Niddrie

"I have the honour to inform you that the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, considered the matter raised in your letters of 11 March 1975 and 23 January 1976 at its 269th meeting.

"The Committee shares your concern at the unfortunate chain of events that have resulted in the imprisonment of Mr. McIntosh by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. It has not lost hope that circumstances might yet occur that could bring to an end Mr. McIntosh's ordeal. Regrettably, the Committee is in no position, under the terms of its mandate, to institute any direct measures that might bring about such circumstances."

6. Meanwhile, a reply dated 11 June 1976 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... the Austrian authorities investigating case No. 171 (expansion of the steel plant of the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Co., RISCO) have established direct contact with the witness suggested by the Research Group and have questioned him about details known to him concerning a possible participation of the company formerly known as VOEST in carrying out of the RISCO project.

"His evidence has confirmed the accuracy of statements made by VOEST in the course of earlier investigations to the effect that SAEPIC, a South African company (South African Engineering Projects and Industrial Installations Consortium) and not RISCO has acted as VOEST's contracting partner, i.e. as the purchaser of the steel plant installation in question.

"Information concerning further developments of this transaction could not be provided by the witness, nor did his testimony produce any new leads helpful in the establishment of details hitherto unknown concerning participation of VOEST in the transactions under consideration.

"The Austrian authorities conducting the investigation of the present case consider the following fact to be of special relevance:

"The witness, although explicitly questioned in this regard was not aware of any action taken by the management of VOEST in order to cover up an

alleged involvement in the RISCO project or attempts made by the same management to intimidate potential witnesses, as has been alleged in a telegram dated 24 November 1975, addressed to the Sanctions Committee by the so-called Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions.

7. A letter dated 22 June 1976 was received from the International Pig Iron Secretariat. The relevant part of the letter is reproduced below.

"In reply to your letter dated 17 June we inform you that The Rhodesian Iron and Steel Company Limited is no longer a member of the International Pig Iron Secretariat."

8. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 276th meeting, on 6 August 1976, a letter was sent by the Chairman to the International Pig Iron Secretariat and a press communiqué was issued by the Committee on the matter. The substantive parts of the letter and the press communiqué are reproduced below.

(i) Letter to the International Pig Iron Secretariat

"At the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to thank you for your letter of 22 June 1976 and to express the Committee's appreciation for the information that the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Company, Ltd. (RISCO) is no longer a member of the International Pig Iron Secretariat. The Committee is pleased with the favourable outcome of this matter.

"The Committee hopes that the International Pig Iron Secretariat will continue to exercise the utmost vigilance to ensure that the mandatory sanctions of the Security Council against Southern Rhodesia are strictly enforced."

(ii) Text of the communiqué by the Security Council's Sanctions Committee regarding the expulsion of the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Company (RISCO) from the International Pig Iron Secretariat

"Following is the text of a statement issued today by the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia:

"Since April 1974, the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia has been continuing its consideration of an extremely important case involving violations of the mandatory sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia. The case, which was the subject of a special report to the Security Council (S/11597), as well as of an earlier press release (SC/3542), involved external participation by a consortium of 13 financial institutions and companies from a number of countries in a scheme, drawn up in 1972, for the expansion of steel production by the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Company, Ltd. (RISCO) from 400,000 to 1 million tons per year. The scheme, reported to have been at least partially completed, was estimated to cost \$R 63.5 million, of which \$R 42.5 million was to be derived from external sources. The evidence indicated that the intention of those concerned in Southern Rhodesia was to

secure much needed foreign exchange on a very significant scale by exporting all or part of the increased production, thereby benefiting the economy of the illegal régime.

"During September 1975, the Committee had received certain information which it had brought to the attention of the International Pig Iron Secretariat, concerning the possibility of participation by RISCO, through its membership in that association, in a joint research project. According to that information the European Coal and Steel Community Technical Research Committee had approved a grant of about £20,000 towards a research project that would be undertaken jointly by RISCO, the British Pig Iron Group and their counterparts in Finland, France, Italy, Norway and Sweden. Subsequent representations at different levels had resulted in cancellation of the research contract to that group and its award, instead, to another consortium that excluded RISCO. Nevertheless the Committee had felt that it should address itself to the International Secretariat with regard to RISCO membership in that organization. The Committee considered that such membership might be exploited to enhance the position of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and that participation of RISCO, or any other organ of the régime, in such international economic activity was, in any case, contrary to the Security Council sanctions against that régime.

"The Committee had therefore decided to request from the International Pig Iron Secretariat comments on the circumstances of that membership, as well as information on the measures contemplated by the constituent members of the organization to ensure the expulsion of RISCO therefrom.

"At its 276th meeting on 22 July 1976, the Committee had before it a letter dated 22 June 1976 from the International Pig Iron Secretariat informing the Committee that the Rhodesian Iron and Steel Company, Ltd. (RISCO) was no longer a member of the association. The Committee was pleased with the favorable outcome in this matter and decided to send a letter of appreciation to the International Pig Iron Secretariat and to make this information public through this press release."

9. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 16 August 1976.

10. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 276th meeting a further note dated 31 August 1976 was sent to Austria, under the no-objection procedure. On the same day, in accordance with the Committee's decision at the 277th meeting, a letter was similarly sent by the Chairman to the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions. The substantive parts of the note and the letter are reproduced below.

(i) Note to Austria

"The Committee noted that the Federal Government of Austria had established direct contact with the witness named by the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions and had questioned him about details known to the witness concerning possible participation of the company formerly known as VOEST in carrying out of the RISCO project. The Committee was surprised to learn that the testimony of the witness did not produce any new leads helpful in the establishment of details hitherto unknown concerning the participation of VOEST in the transactions under consideration. It was all the more puzzled

to learn that the witness, although explicitly questioned in this regard, was not aware of any action taken by the management of VOEST in order to cover up an alleged involvement in the RISCO project or attempts made by the same management to intimidate potential witnesses, as had been alleged in a telegram dated 24 November 1975 addressed to the Committee by the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions. In view of the apparent differences in the testimony given by the witness to the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions on the one hand, and to the competent Austrian authorities on the other, the Committee wonders whether the investigating authorities were satisfied that the witness gave them his free and frank testimony and that he was not subject to third party pressures to inhibit his testimony. The Committee expressed the hope, therefore, that the Austrian authorities might investigate this case further with a view to establishing whether any such pressures were put on the witness and why his testimony differed from the information given to the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions.

"In accordance with the Committee's request, the Secretary-General would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter at its earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

(ii) Letter to the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions

"At the request of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, I have the honour to refer to the letter addressed to you by the Chairman of the Committee on 4 September 1975 and your cables of 16 September and 24 November 1975 to the Secretary of the Committee, as well as your letter of 3 November 1975 to the latter, and the 9 December 1975 letter to you from the Committee Secretary, all regarding the possibility of obtaining information from an Austrian national covering the participation of VOEST in RISCO construction projects.

"The Committee has now received information from the Government of Austria in a note dated 11 June 1976, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

[The text quoted here was the same as that reproduced in para. 6 above.]

"The Committee was perplexed by the apparent differences in the testimony given by the witness to the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions on one hand, and to the Austrian authorities on the other. In these circumstances, the Committee wishes to renew its earlier requests to the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions that the testimony obtained from the witness by the Research Group, as well as any other relevant information, be forwarded to the Committee so that it may proceed toward the resolution of this matter.

"I should greatly appreciate receiving your reply to this request as soon as possible."

11. A second reminder was sent to Switzerland on 21 September 1976.

12. A reply dated 29 September 1976 was received from the Research Group enclosing a notarized text of the testimony given by the witness. The substantive part of the letter and the text of the testimony are given below.

Letter from the Research Group for
Interparliamentary Questions

"With reference to your letter of 31 August 1976, we hereby transmit to you the testimony of [our witness]. We also have [his] approval for the following summary of his comments on the passages from the Austrian Government's note dated 11 June 1976 as quoted in your letter to us.

"Ref. Para. 1 (of quotation from Austrian note):

It is worth noting that the witness was not contacted before March 1976 whereas the Research Group had informed the Sanctions Committee of his identity already on 16 September 1975. It is also worth noting that [the witness] was not contacted through the Research Group but directly. In a written invitation dated 5 March 1976 [he] was invited by the Federal Chancellery to present himself at the seat of Chancellery Section IV (Nationalized Industries) for an interview on 24 March 1976 with Dr. Dr. Dr. (henceforth Mr.) Beelitz. Also present was an official of the Austrian Foreign Office. Since the officials explained that the interview was to be informal, [the witness] insisted that he would divulge full details and the names of individuals only in a formal, sworn testimony in the presence of a duly empowered attorney.

No minutes of the discussion were afterwards presented to [him] for counter-signature. [He] is amazed by the fact that no more than thirty lines were considered sufficient by the Austrian authorities to report on his remarks to Mr. Beelitz to whom he talked for more than one hour.

"Ref. Para. 3

In the interview [the witness] did inform Mr. Beelitz of the main points contained in his enclosed testimony. The Austrian Government, by saying in its note of 11 June 1976 that [the witness'] statements contained nothing 'new' regarding the 'participation of VOEST in the transactions under consideration', creates the impression that it is accepting these statements as fact. In that case: why not prosecute VOEST for sanctions violations?

"Ref. Para. 4

It was never alleged that VOEST's 'Management' was attempting a cover-up. But [the witness] did inform the Research Group, and he now testifies in his sworn statement that in November 1975 investigations were carried out at his former department at VOEST, concerning his person, and that his former colleagues were told to observe strict silence concerning 'Saepic'.

Finally, [the witness] protests against the false impression created by the Austrian note of 11 June 1976 that he had had an opportunity to give his formal testimony before the Austrian investigating authorities. In fact, he was never confronted or acquainted with any such authority. [He] furthermore protests against the false impression created by the Austrian note that he had withdrawn from his earlier statements which the Research Group had communicated to your Committee."

Testimony of /the witness/

SWORN STATEMENT

The witness gave his name and those of his parents and continued: I am an Austrian citizen, born on 3 October 1950 at Wels (Oberösterreich). ... I am a graduate engineer. I am currently studying mechanical engineering at the Technical University, Vienna. I hold an Austrian passport No. J 0125567, issued on 28 June 1973 by the Austrian Consulate-General, Munich. From August 1971 to May 1972, I was employed at the United Austrian Steelworks (VÖEST) at Linz (Donau) in Division TJ 31.

Project SAEPIC II

At the time of my employment in Division TJ 31, work was being done for the construction of an electrical plant for a steelworks. It was clear from the relevant drawings that it was a question of expanding an existing plant. I was struck by the fact that, for our construction drawings, instead of the usual paper headed with the firm's name "VÖEST", we used plain paper to which had been glued a specially prepared label with the name "SAEPIC". When on one occasion by mistake I used drawing paper with the usual "VÖEST" heading, my supervisor, Mr. Hirscher, told me that the project was intended for Rhodesia and that the name "VÖEST" must not appear on the drawings.

A Mr. Steiner was responsible for actually carrying out at the project site in Rhodesia the construction plans prepared by TJ 31. Some time in autumn 1971, Mr. Steiner returned from Rhodesia to Division TJ 31 at VÖEST. There, he took part on the basis of his local knowledge in work for the project. He frequently told his colleagues in Division TJ 31 of his impressions of Rhodesia. A few weeks later Mr. Steiner returned to Rhodesia, and sent a greeting card from there to his colleagues in TJ 31. According to my knowledge of the project, numerous divisions within VÖEST participated in the work on project SAEPIC.

A study of the plans prepared at VÖEST at that time for project SAEPIC must, I am convinced, demonstrate that the project could be properly implemented only in Southern Rhodesia. If necessary, I can give the names of various colleagues who collaborated on project SAEPIC.

After my separation from VÖEST, I learnt from former colleagues that at VÖEST during the week of 17-21 November 1975:

- (a) The Division management sought information about me from my former colleagues;
- (b) All the information concerning me was collected;
- (c) Inquiries were addressed to my former supervisors concerning the projects I had worked on;
- (d) Colleagues on project SAEPIC were sworn to secrecy with regard to the project.

Reason for this testimony

I first became aware of the RISCO case as a result of an article entitled "Despatch from Salisbury", which appeared in Der Spiegel (Hamburg) on 3 June 1974 (see attached copy). p/ I became informed about the Rhodesian problem from my political work with the Socialist Party of Germany (SPD) (Regensburg, Local Group 250). The SPD had announced at its party day in April 1973 its decision to give political and moral support to the liberation movements in southern Africa. As a member of the SPD, I considered myself under an obligation to communicate my personal knowledge and experiences relating to the RISCO case. As a result of my letter to Der Spiegel, there appeared in its issue No. 35 (1974) an article entitled "Codeword SAEPIC" (see attached copy). p/ In addition, I declared my readiness to place myself at the disposal of the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions of my comrade Reinhard Spilker, who had already for a considerable time been taking part in investigating violations of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

Moreover, as an Austrian citizen, I feel under an obligation to provide testimony because:

(1) The authorities of the Republic of Austria have an interest in having Vienna become the future headquarters for the United Nations and hence must therefore be all the more interested in a speedy clearing-up of the RISCO case, with its burden on Austria;

(2) It is also in the obvious economic interest of the Republic of Austria and of its State enterprise VÖEST-Alpine to maintain good relations with the future African majority Governments of the States of southern Africa. I assume that the Austrian Government shares this assessment.

I reject the policy of apartheid and every form of racism as a matter of personal and political conviction. My testimony is conceived as a contribution to the implementation of the United Nations sanctions against the régime of Southern Rhodesia. I regard sanctions as a last attempt to help the oppressed African majority of that country to obtain their rightful position without violence.

In giving this testimony, I am responding to the appeals of the Security Council dated 4 September 1973 and 21 May 1975, in which it requested private organizations and individuals to support the Sanctions Committee in its task of investigation.

I am ready and willing to give further information on the basis of my knowledge of the foregoing.

p/ The substance of the attached newspapers was essentially the same as the articles that appeared in the Sunday Times and the Times, London, in April 1974, a full account of which was given in the Committee's special report on the case (S/11597, annex I).

The signature overleaf, prepared by me, of
/the witness/ student, of Spandauer Strasse 2, 8400 Regensburg - identified
by production of his Austrian passport - is hereby notarized.

Kassel, 23 September 1976

(Signature illegible)
Notary

Account

Amount: 5,000 DM

Fee	11.30 DM
5.5 per cent value-added tax	0.62 DM
	<u>11.92 DM</u>

13. An acknowledgement was sent to the Research Group on 12 October 1976.
14. A first reminder was sent to Austria and a third reminder to Switzerland on 3 November 1976.
15. Replies were received from Switzerland and Austria, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 29 October 1976 from Switzerland

"The Swiss authorities have been unable to obtain any further information on this case. However, they have been able definitely to establish that no official body has given any support to the financial operations which the Committee on Sanctions presumes to have taken place.

"As to the specific developments in this case, namely, contracts for the sale of steel billets presumed to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, concluded through Femetco SA at Zug, q/ the federal authorities are not in a position to object to such transactions as long as the goods concerned do not touch Swiss territory. Their position of principle was explained in detail in the Observer's replies to the Secretary-General concerning Case Nos. 2 and 113, concerning the transactions of Nitrex SA and Rif Trading Company, Ltd.

"Realizing the importance of the RISCO case to the Committee, the Swiss authorities reiterate their willingness to resume consideration of this case at any time should the Committee obtain further information regarding it."

q/ Appears to refer to the specific cases arising out of RISCO, which have been reported to the Committee by the United Kingdom, namely Case Nos. 236, 239, 246, 265 and 266.

(ii) Note dated 12 November 1976 from Austria

"The Permanent Representative of Austria to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General of the following.

"1. Upon being interviewed by the competent Austrian authorities on 24 March 1976 the witness appeared in no way intimidated and had the opportunity to fully express himself on his personal observations as to the participation of VÖEST in the expansion of the steel mill of RISCO. The Austrian authorities had no reason whatsoever to believe that the witness, when making his statements, was in any way under pressure or that he had been subject to any influence designed to make his statements favorable to the Austrian company.

"The witness was asked whether he was aware of any concrete instances of intimidation of employees of VÖEST by the management designed to prevent such employees from giving information on the participation of VÖEST in the expansion of the steel mill of RISCO. He answered this question clearly and emphatically in the negative.

"2. The investigating Austrian authorities are not in a position to know what information the witness provided to representatives of the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions concerning alleged measures by VÖEST designed to cover up details of the case in question.

"A question put to the witness during his interview as to this point, i.e. alleged cover-up, was, however, answered by him clearly and emphatically in the negative.

"Allegations as to a cover-up within VÖEST must seem all the more unfounded as the company had already from the very beginning of the investigations fully and in all frankness co-operated and made available details concerning the case in question.

"3. In conclusion, it is stated that the investigating Austrian authorities had no reason to doubt the frank testimony of the witness, all the more so since that testimony was compatible with the results of investigations which are already available and had been conveyed to the Committee.

"The investigating Austrian authorities have, however, no knowledge as to the information given by the witness to representatives of the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions which might go beyond the information already provided to these authorities by the Committee.

"If the Committee should have concrete information indicating intimidation of the witness or cover-up operations by the management of VÖEST - contrary to the results of previous investigations and to the relevant testimony of the witness on 24 March 1976 - the Austrian authorities would appreciate receiving such information in order to make it the basis of an investigation.

"Should the Committee wish to be informed of details of the testimony

given by the witness to the investigating Austrian authorities, the Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations would be ready to make the minutes of the interview in question accessible to a representative of the Committee."

16. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 278th meeting, a note dated 29 November 1976 was sent to Austria under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"At its 278th meeting the Committee considered the above-mentioned case and had before it a letter dated 29 September 1976 from the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, enclosing a notarized testimony of their witness, regarding the alleged involvement of VÖEST in RISCO. The letter from the Research Group was in response to the surprise registered by the Committee, bearing in mind His Excellency's earlier reply of 11 June 1976, that the witness should have given such conflicting testimony to the Research Group and to the Austrian authorities. The Committee also expressed similar surprise in the note sent to His Excellency's Government on 31 August 1976.

"In accordance with its decision at the above-mentioned meeting and taking into account the co-operative undertaking offered by the Austrian authorities in His Excellency's latest note, the Committee is pleased to transmit herewith a copy of the Research Group's letter including a copy of the notarized testimony in the original, for any comments that His Excellency's Government might be able to make thereon.

"The Committee also expressed the hope that such comments, if available, might be forwarded to it at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

(228) Case No. 176. New Zealand insurance companies: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. The case was discussed at the 271st meeting on 3 June 1976, at which the Committee decided that it should be considered closed.

(229) Case No. 203. Payment by Southern Rhodesian bank to Austrian company: United Kingdom note dated 7 March 1975

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 269th meeting, a note dated 9 June 1976 was sent to Austria, requesting the Government to obtain further

information from the Austrian firm involved; in particular, information as to the address of the South African firm Miner Metals (Pty), Ltd., and the nature of dealings that the Austrian company had had with the South African firm, previously or subsequently.

4. A reply dated 14 July 1976 was received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of Austria to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General as follows:

"According to information supplied by the Austrian firm Simmering-Graz-Pauker AG on the additional questions raised by the Committee, correspondence was carried out with the South African company Miner Metals (Pty), Ltd., at the address: 40 Commissioner Street, P.O. Box 9616, Johannesburg.

"The Austrian firm continues to receive minor individual orders for parts of standard locomotives from the above-mentioned company, which is duly registered in South Africa.

"On this occasion the Austrian firm Simmering-Graz-Pauker reiterated its assurance that it does not maintain any business relations with Southern Rhodesia. Furthermore, there is no indication from which it could conclude that the material it delivered to the South African company Miner Metals (Pty), Ltd., was forwarded by the same to Southern Rhodesia."

5. At the 280th meeting on 18 November 1976, the Committee considered the reply from Austria and decided that a further note should be sent to the Government of Austria, pointing out that there seemed to be considerable circumstantial evidence that Miner Metals (Pty), Ltd., was simply a mailing address in South Africa; asking the Government of Austria to ascertain whether Simmering-Graz-Pauker AG had ever had any dealings with Miner Metals other than by post, and whether there was any evidence that it was a bona fide South African firm; and, if no evidence of that could be found, requesting the Austrian Government to ask Simmering-Graz-Pauker AG to exercise some circumspection in its future dealings with the company. At the time of preparation of the present report action on the Committee's decision was under way.

(230) Case No. 208. Financial loan to a Southern Rhodesian company: United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1975

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 22 December 1975 was received from Luxembourg, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Being anxious to co-operate in the effective implementation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the Government of Luxembourg had occasion in its earlier note of 12 June 1975, to provide the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of that resolution with

the information it managed to obtain as the result of an investigation conducted within the framework of the constitutional and legal provisions governing the field of private economic and financial activities in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

"Further careful reconsideration of possible action in that context has led to the conclusion that no other steps can legally be contemplated and, in the circumstances, the Government of the Grand Duchy can only reconfirm its previous comments.

"It wishes to emphasize moreover, the essential point that the necessary measures have been taken to ensure that the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) are fully implemented."

4. A first reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 9 January 1976.

5. A communication dated 14 January 1976 was received from the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany stating that the investigations currently being conducted by the competent federal authorities were still going on and that as soon as information was received from the Federal Foreign Office it would be conveyed promptly to the Committee.

6. A reply dated 24 February 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Commerzbank International Societé Anonyme, Luxembourg, is not a branch of the German Commerzbank AG but a stock company incorporated under Luxembourg law and subject solely to the banking supervision of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

"Apart from the above, investigations conducted at the German Commerzbank have shown that its records give no indication of the financing of a loan to a Southern Rhodesian company or to the Union Acceptances, Ltd., of Marshall Town, Johannesburg, respectively."

N. TOURISM AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

(231) Case No. 143. Southern Rhodesian representational offices abroad: information obtained from published sources and from non-governmental sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information received since the submission of that report is given below:

(a) Rhodesia National Tourist Board, Basel, Switzerland

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

(b) Rhodesian information centre and Air Rhodesia office, Sydney, Australia

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

(c) Rhodesia information office, Washington, DC, USA

5. A communication dated 6 April 1976, addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, was received from Ms. Barbara Rogers, a collaborator with the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, Bonn. The substantive text of the communication is reproduced below.

"I understand that the Sanctions Committee continues to be interested in the operations of the Rhodesian information office in Washington, DC, USA. I am therefore enclosing for your information copies of the most recent registration statement filed by the RIO with the US Department of Justice. Comparing this with the detailed study of the RIO which I carried out some two or three years ago for the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Africa, it is evident that no substantive changes have been made, and no action taken by the United States Government. Copies of the Subcommittee's hearings on this issue were made available to the Sanctions Committee. As you may recall, both officials are members of the Rhodesian régime's diplomatic service, Mr. Hooper having no legal basis for remaining in the United States. Both he and Mr. Towsey have Rhodesian passports. The Rhodesian information office's links with the illegal régime are quite clearly spelled out in the registration statement."

6. The enclosed document was a copy of the financial statement filed with the United States Department of Justice by the Rhodesian information office, indicating that office's financial resources, disbursements and operations during the six-month period ended 30 January 1976, as required under the provisions of the United States Foreign Agents Registration Act, 1938, as amended. The document mentioned an attachment, "Appendix A", said to contain the financial details. The attachment was, however, not transmitted with the document. The Committee expressed the hope, therefore, that it might receive a copy of that appendix from the United States Department of Justice.

7. At the 268th meeting on 5 May 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement on the matter in which he informed the Committee that his delegation was in possession of the documents relating to the Rhodesian information office and hoped to take follow-up action in connexion with the information provided by Miss Barbara Rogers.

8. The matter was discussed at the 269th meeting of the Committee, at which the representative of the United States made the following statement:

"The Rhodesian information office has no official, consular, or diplomatic status whatsoever; it was established and registered with the Department of Justice as a foreign agent under the Foreign Agent's Registration Act prior to the Rhodesian UDI in 1965. Prior to that time it was a part of the British Embassy. Because of its establishment and registration as a separate organization before UDI, we were not able to close it at that time.

"It has been allowed to continue its operation since UDI simply because there are no legal grounds on which we can close the office - so long as that office fully complies with US law. Its operations and activities are being carefully monitored and we will not hesitate to take appropriate legal action against the Rhodesian information office in the event of any evidence of violation of US law.

"The present Rhodesian employees at the Rhodesian information office were in the US at the time of UDI. No visas will be issued for any replacements of those employees or to supplement the staff."

9. At the same meeting the Committee felt that it should discuss the entire question of Southern Rhodesian information and tourist offices abroad. It would remain seized of the case on the understanding that the United States delegation would make the necessary inquiries and take the necessary action, bearing in mind that the Southern Rhodesian office in Washington, DC, was acting in furtherance of activities of the illegal régime and that furtherance of such activities was forbidden under Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

10. The representative of the United States assured the Committee that the matter was already receiving the attention of his Government, which was continuing to monitor the office's activities for illegal acts. He would in any event inform his Government of the depth of the Committee's concern. He stated, however, that there was no Southern Rhodesian tourist office in the United States, since the office in New York had been closed.

11. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976 the representative of the United States made a statement concerning several cases under consideration. The text of that part of the statement pertaining to this case is reproduced below:

"... On Case No. 143, the United States Justice Department is forwarding the requested document, appendix A. We will make it available to the Committee as soon as possible."

12. At the 282nd meeting on 9 December 1976, the representative of the United States submitted the required document as well as other documents relating to the reports filed by the Rhodesian information office for the six-month periods ended 31 January 1975, 31 July 1975 and 31 July 1976. At the time of the preparation of the present report, the documents so submitted were being analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant.

(d) Rhodesia information office, Paris, France

13. For additional information concerning this matter see paragraph 5 of (238) Case No. 15⁴ and Case No. INGO-12 in annex V below.

(232) Case No. 190. Tourism agencies and Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the Committee considered the matter and noted that replies to its notes of inquiry were still pending from Belgium and South Africa; that no information has been received from the representative of France, and that no additional information has been received from the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States further to the statements made by the representatives of the two delegations at the Committee's 209th meeting.
4. At the same meeting the Committee decided that notes should be prepared for transmission to the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands. In the case of the Federal Republic of Germany, the note would request further information in connexion with the attendance at the conference by the representative of Lufthansa and the financial arrangements that had facilitated his attendance. In the case of the Netherlands, the Committee would inquire whether the Government intended to take any action with regard to the violation of at least the spirit of the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee also decided that appropriate notes should be prepared for transmission to the Governments of Belgium, France, the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as a letter to the Secretary-General of the Universal Federation of Travel Agents' Association (UFTAA) requesting him to provide the additional information promised.
5. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent by the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of South Africa, announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case in connexion with which a reply was still pending after two reminders. At the time of preparation of the present report the proposed meeting had not yet taken place.
6. Further to paragraph 4 above, the proposed notes and letter were sent to Belgium, France, the United States and the United Kingdom and to the Secretary-General of UFTAA on 24 August 1976, and to the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany on 26 August 1976, all under the no-objection procedure.
7. An acknowledgement dated 17 September 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany.
8. Replies were received from France, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 22 September 1976 from France

"The Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform him of the following. After a thorough inquiry, the Ministry of State for Tourism has ascertained that no French travel agency was represented at the annual conference of the Association of South Africa Travel Agents which was held in Southern Rhodesia in 1974.

"It added that the National Association of Travel Bureaux and Agencies (Syndicat national des Bureaux et Agences de voyages) did not send a representative to that conference.

"If a 'French tourism expert' did attend such a conference - a point which it was impossible to confirm - he could have done so only in a strictly personal capacity. He would not, in any event, have represented any French association or agency.

"The Ministry of State for Tourism further points out that it never fails, when it is consulted, to draw attention to the illegality of the Salisbury régime and to the obligations of all to comply scrupulously with the sanctions against that de facto régime."

(ii) Note dated 22 September 1976 from the United Kingdom

"The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations ... has the honour to communicate the following. Inquiries were made last year into the allegation that a representative of British Airways had attended the annual conference of the Association of South African Travel Agents in Southern Rhodesia in September 1974. These inquiries revealed that no official representative of British Airways had attended such a conference. Inquiries made failed to establish whether an employee of British Airways had in fact been present in an individual capacity, and whether the presence of such a person had been misrepresented by the Rhodesian authorities for their own purposes. What is clear is that British Airways were not represented. It is regretted that, through an oversight, this information was not passed to the Committee at the time.

"The Committee will be aware of the general position of Her Majesty's Government as regards visits by individuals to Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom authorities are able to put pressure on representative groups or individuals to prevent their attendance at events outside Rhodesia, especially when information is obtained in advance. But it is not possible to prevent individuals from making their way privately to Southern Rhodesia, where their presence is sometimes misrepresented by the illegal authorities for their own propaganda purposes. The British authorities will continue to discourage its citizens from attending conferences or similar gatherings inside Southern Rhodesia."

(iii) Note dated 2 December 1976 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to reiterate that the Association of Southern African Travel Agents (ASATA) is a professional association with headquarters in South Africa. Lufthansa German Airlines has no way of influencing ASATA's decisions on the venue of its annual conferences. The Lufthansa representative attended the annual conference in September 1974, which took place in Southern Rhodesia, for the sole purpose of cultivating his contacts with the representatives of all branches of the South African tourist industry who had assembled there. He had no business talks whatsoever with Southern Rhodesian representatives.

"As to the financial arrangements that had facilitated his attendance at the conference and the reasons that led the federal authorities to conclude that there had been no violation of sanctions, the Federal Government states the following:

"From business transacted in earlier years, Lufthansa German Airline still has certain assets in Southern Rhodesia which, for a number of reasons, it has not yet been able to realize. The costs of the attendance at the conference by the Lufthansa representative were charged against part of these accounts."

9. First reminders were sent to Belgium and the Netherlands on 15 December 1976.
10. A reply of the same data was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Because of his participation in the annual conference of the Association of South African Travel Agents in 1974 the Managing Director of KLM (SA) (Pty), Ltd., in affiliate of KLM established in South Africa, paid a 'registration fee' to the Secretary of the South African Travel Agencies in Johannesburg, South Africa. The amount was paid in South African rand.

"No funds were remitted to Southern Rhodesia by KLM or by KLM (SA) (Pty), Ltd., as a consequence of his attendance at the above-mentioned conference."

11. In the absence of a reply from Belgium the Committee included that Government in the eleventh quarterly list of Governments that had failed to reply to the Committee's inquiries within the prescribed period of two months.

(233) Case No. 194. Holiday Inns and car rentals: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 278th meeting, on 4 November 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement to the Committee, the text of which is reproduced below:

"In compliance with Security Council resolution 388 (1976) of 6 April 1976, the United States Government contacted the Holiday Inn and Avis corporations to advise them of their obligations pursuant to resolution 388 (1976), to terminate the subfranchises in Southern Rhodesia held by the Holiday Inn and Avis franchises in South Africa. As a result of action by the United States Government, the Avis and Holiday Inn corporations have instructed the companies in South Africa holding the subfranchises in Southern Rhodesia to end those subfranchises.

"A subfranchise of the British Hertz Company in Southern Rhodesia was terminated in 1974."

(234) Case No. 213. Flights to and from Southern Rhodesia: case opened at the 243rd meeting

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Second and third reminders were sent to Malawi, Portugal and South Africa on 14 January and 26 February 1976, respectively.
4. In the absence of replies from Malawi, Portugal and South Africa, the Committee again included those Governments in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.
5. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representatives of Malawi, Portugal and South Africa announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting them at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.
6. On 16 August and 21 September 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representatives of Malawi and Portugal, respectively and individually, and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meetings, see the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.
7. Subsequently, a reply dated 27 September 1976, also covering Case No. INGO-4, was received from the Permanent Representative of Malawi, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In connexion with Case Nos. 213 and INGO-4, I am pleased to advise that I am now in possession of the requested official reply.

"Accordingly, upon instructions of my Government, I am directed to inform your Committee that air services between Malawi and Southern Rhodesia are no longer operational and that external trade links, too, with that beleaguered country have been severed for quite a spell now.

"In placing the foregoing information at your Committee's disposal, I also hasten to draw attention to the serious adverse economic situation with which my Government is now confronted as a result of that action. Therefore, my Government has been obliged to carry out a preliminary assessment in an attempt to quantify, in some measure, the degree of damage to the country's economy. On the basis of that assessment, my Government has already initiated action to seek international aid, in order to alleviate the difficulty. As the substance of that preliminary assessment appears to be pertinent to your committee's work, I take the liberty to attach a copy for your study and record.

Text of the attachment

"SPECIAL REPORT ON THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES TO MALAWI FOLLOWING
THE CLOSURE OF MOZAMBIQUE/SOUTHERN RHODESIA BORDER

"1. Malawi, as one of the countries in the southern Africa subregion, has directly and adversely been economically affected by the closure of the Mozambique/Southern Rhodesia border. As a former colonial possession, Malawi was both a protectorate and a member of the defunct Central African Federation of Rhodesia and Nyassland. She was the poorest member of that unholy political association. As a result her economy was conveniently, if not systematically, neglected. Therefore, in keeping with that neglect, her economy was tied to the economies of Mozambique - formerly overseas Province of Portugal; Southern Rhodesia as well as South Africa. And incidentally it should be pointed out that the said defunct Central African Federation referred to above was itself completely landlocked.

"2. Therefore, against the background of the political reality of the time, the development of the economic services of that subregion were extended to Malawi largely because she proved to be a reservoir of cheap but reliable labour; market for the manufactured goods of her rich neighbours and because they facilitated the administration of the protectorate. The colonial administration also took full advantage of Malawi's geographical position as a landlocked country by ensuring that all her trade routes were oriented southward. This policy has had serious implications for the neighbouring countries as confirmed in a recent statement made by the co-ordinator of United Nations assistance to Zambia on behalf of the Secretary-General, which he made to the 61st session of ECOSOC meeting held on 27 July last.

"3. Malawi gained political independence in July 1964. One of the most important basic economic objectives pursued by the newly elected Government was the positive development of the country's agricultural potential. In this connexion, the Government exploited to the full the country's human resources with which she is endowed. Therefore, Malawi's incapacity 'to implement fully the United Nations mandatory sanctions policy', should be viewed within the context of the economic situation which she inherited with the advent of independence. Therefore, any action to even attempt to implement 'the United Nations mandatory sanctions policy' would have spelt immediate economic strangulation for the entire country. In a nutshell, that was the predicament with which the young republic was confronted.

"4. Against that sombre economic background the Life President of the Republic of Malawi, Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, has for more than a decade provided the young republic with enlightened and dynamic leadership which has not only brought political stability to but has also revolutionized the economy of the country. It is this economy which has now been eroded by the consequences of the closure of the border under review.

"5. Therefore, since the closure of that border Malawi imports from South Africa now take other higher-cost routes. It is equally true to say that for certain, other imports, alternative markets and sources of supply must be and are being found. Inevitably, the estimated cost of these changes, at this stage, must be tentative. However, the calculations that follow are based generally on the latest data collected by the National Statistical office for 1975, and are estimates for a full year.

AIR MALAWI - NET REVENUE LOSS K 1,280,000 (\$1,392,384) p.a.

"I. Air Malawi estimate a net revenue loss of K 1,280,000 taking into account the loss of nine passenger services per week in particular on the Blantyre Salisbury route, and the effects of this on generated traffic on other routes, such as those to East Africa and Zambia.

"II. ROAD TRANSPORTERS - NET REVENUE LOSS K 250,000 (\$271,950) p.a.

"The closure of the border has meant that road transport between Blantyre and Salisbury has ceased to operate. The Ministry of Transport and Communications estimate that hauliers' revenues have been reduced by approximately K 250,000 per annum.

"III. HOTELS AND TOURISM - NET REVENUE LOSS K 270,000 (\$293,706) p.a.

"The Ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism estimate that the number of tourists from Rhodesia can be expected to fall from approximately 9,000 spending K 600,000 during 1975, to not more than 5,000 spending K 330,000, during 1976, with a consequent loss to the economy of about K 270,000 in foreign exchange. Clearly the actual loss could be considerably greater.

"IV. LOSS OF EXPORT EARNINGS - K 2,000,000 (\$2,175,600) p.a.

"Using the 1975 trade returns from the National Statistical Office, loss of export earnings is estimated on the basis that all earnings from those goods for which the Rhodesian market accounted for over 75 per cent of exports in 1975 will be lost. Although there will be some successful redirection of such goods to other markets, it is assumed that this will be offset by losses of markets for goods of which the Rhodesian market share is less than 75 per cent, but which fail to find an alternative market. In 1975, the total value of exports to Rhodesia was K 7.4 million, and the percentage loss of earnings is conservatively estimated at 27 per cent. Furthermore, some of Malawi's exports to South Africa which in 1975 amounted to K 5.6 million, may be adversely affected because of higher transport costs, and this potential loss is not included.

"V. ADDITIONAL COST OF IMPORTS - K 18,700,000 (\$20,341,860) p.a.

"In order to estimate the additional cost of import for Malawi, the average difference has been calculated between unit values c.i.f. Malawi border of imports from Rhodesia, and the corresponding unit values of imports from the cheapest and most practical alternative source, weighted by the value of the commodity in 1975 trade.

"In the majority of cases the cheapest and most practical alternative source of supply is South Africa. But South African traffic is no longer able to use the rail route to and from Malawi, and the direct road route via Rhodesia is also closed. The most promising alternatives at the present time are a sea link between Durban and Beira (or Nacala), and an air freight link between Johannesburg and Blantyre. On the basis of Ministry of Transport and Communications freight rate estimates, it is assumed that 50 per cent of the diverted imports will incur additional transport costs by using these suboptimal rail/sea/rail, and air routes from South Africa.

"Malawi's import bill will also be increased by the increase in transport costs for those existing South African imports which formerly moved over Rhodesia Railways through Botswana and Rhodesia, for onward transit to Malawi, via Mozambique. This is the normal routing for all supplies originating in and around Johannesburg and the Northern Transvaal. The Ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism estimate that approximately 50 per cent of Malawi's imports from South Africa, valued in 1975 at K 52.7 million, will be affected by higher transport costs.

Thus - additional cost of imports diverted from Rhodesian sources to the best alternative sources	K 8,000,000 (\$8,702,400)
Additional transport costs for such imports	K 4,100,000 (\$4,459,980)
Additional transport costs for imports from South Africa formerly transported by rail/road through Rhodesia	K 6,600,000 (\$7,179,480)
	<u>K 18,700,000 (\$20,341,860)</u>

"It is fully recognized that the use of import unit values as a basis for this part of the cost estimates has many shortcomings. However, where non-price factors, for example, quality differences - make comparisons between Rhodesian and alternative source import unit values unrealistic, they have been omitted.

"Furthermore, the basic estimates do not take into account the effects of economic growth or price increases which would otherwise have increased the figures for 1976, and only 1975 data has been used. Thus, on the basis of past growth rates of trade with Rhodesia and South Africa, the estimated additional cost of diverting imports from Rhodesia to best alternative sources would be increased by K 3,200,000, and the additional rerouting cost for imports from South Africa affected by the border closure would be increased by K 1,900,000. Also the effect on Malawi re-exports, which, in 1975, were valued at K 790,000 to Rhodesia and K 1,268,000 to South Africa, has not been included.

"Finally, in a separate exercise Malawi Railways Limited have estimated that they will suffer a net revenue loss of K 927,000 in the first full year following the border closure. This has not been included in the basic estimates separately at this stage, primarily to avoid the danger of double-counting the cost of Malawi.

"VI. EFFECTS OF THE BORDER CLOSURE ON THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

"The following table places the estimated costs of the Border Closure in the over-all context of Malawi's balance of payments:

1975 (million kwacha)

	<u>Border open</u>		<u>Border had been closed</u>		<u>Change</u>	
Exports (f.o.b.)	+103.9	(+\$113.0)	+101.9	(\$110.8)	-2.0	(\$2.20)
Re-exports (f.o.b.)	+15.7	(+17.0)	+15.7	(17.0)	-	(-)
Imports (c.i.f.)	-218.3	(-237.5)	-237.0	(257.8)	-18.7	(20.3)
Visible balance	-98.7	(-107.3)	-119.4	(129.8)	-20.7	(22.5)
Other current a/c items	+23.7	(+25.7)	+21.9	+23.8)	1.8	(1.9)
Current a/c balance	-75.0	(-81.5)	-97.5	(106.0)	-22.5	(-24.5)

SUMMARY - ESTIMATED COSTS TO MALAWI OF THE CLOSURE OF THE RHODESIAN BORDER

1. Air Malawi net revenue loss	= K 1,280,000	(\$1,392,384)
2. Road transporters net revenue loss	= K 250,000	(271,950)
3. Hotel and tourism net revenue loss	= K 270,000	(293,706)
4. Malawi loss of export earnings	= K 2,000,000	(2,175,600)
5. Malawi additional cost of imports	=K 18,700,000	(20,341,860)
*	K 22,500,000	(\$24,475,500)

"VII. We estimate on a realistic and conservative basis that K 22,500,000 is the minimum financial assistance needed by Malawi to avoid the most damaging consequences of the closure of the Rhodesian border.

* K 1.00 = \$1.0878 as at April 1976."

8. A comprehensive communication dated 14 October 1976 was also received from Portugal in which reference was made to this and the other cases mentioned in the Chairman's note to Portugal of 13 August 1976, as well as to Case No. 173. For the relevant portion of the communication, see paragraph 7 of (160) Case No. 173 above.

9. Further to paragraph 4 above, the Committee again included South Africa in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

(235) Case No. 227. Organized tours abroad for persons using Southern Rhodesian passports

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 7 January 1976 was received from the Director of the Thomas Cook Group, Ltd., London, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"May I say at the outset that it is this company's expressed intention always to comply with the regulations of the United Nations and to support wholeheartedly the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly.

"We also have to comply with instructions which are issued by the United Kingdom authorities and, consequently, we have no direct control over the offices which trade under the name of Thomas Cook in the country in question.

"We have, however, caused inquiries to be made and are now able to inform you that the advertised holiday to which you have referred is not one organized by Thomas Cook. The content of the advertisement had apparently been lifted from the principal's brochure.

"We have let it be known that the statement about passports does not comply with the intention of the United Nations. We have been informed that the advertisement which included the offending information will be withdrawn and that compliance with the regulations will be observed."

4. First and second reminders were sent to Greece, Portugal and Switzerland on 17 March and 19 April 1976. Subsequently, third reminders were sent to Greece and Portugal on 24 May 1976 and to Switzerland on 25 May 1976.

5. A reply dated 28 May 1976 was received from Greece, together with the text of a press release issued by the Greek Tourism Organization Press Office on 14 May 1976. The substantive part of the Greek reply and the text of the press release read as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations ... has the honour to communicate that the 'National Tourism Organization', in view of the fact that foreign travel agents residing outside Greece advertise in their own countries that Greece receives tourists holding South Rhodesian

passports, issued a press release in this connexion. In the above Press Release, the said organisation points out that, having thoroughly looked into the matter, found out that no national of Southern Rhodesia entered Greece since the adoption of the United Nations resolutions imposing sanctions on Southern Rhodesia.

"In this regard, it is stressed in the aforementioned Press Release that Greece faithfully applies pertinent provisions of the Security Council resolutions on the matter and Greek tourist agents have duly advised their collaborators abroad on the strict implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions by the Greek authorities."

Text of the enclosure

(Unofficial translation)

"Greek Tourism Organisation
"Press Office

Press Release

(1)

Friday 14 May 1976

"It is announced by the
"National Tourism Organisation that:

NO RHODESIAN CITIZEN
HAS ENTERED GREECE

Greece strictly implements pertinent
prohibitive provisions of the Security
Council resolutions

"Foreign travel agents, residing outside Greece, advertise in their own countries that Greece receives tourists holding South Rhodesian passports.

"The National Tourism Organisation announced that after thorough investigations on the matter, it was found out that no citizen of Southern Rhodesia, either as individual or as member of a tourists group, has entered Greece since the adoption by the Security Council of prohibitive provisions in this regard.

"Greece strictly applies the resolutions of the Security Council on the matter and Greek travel agents have already advised their collaborators abroad on the faithful implementation of the said resolutions."

6. A reply dated 1 June 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's notes of 18 November 1975, 17 March 1976 and 19 April 1976, concerning Case No. 227 of a presumed violation of the Security Council sanctions against Rhodesia.

"These notes state that the acceptance of Rhodesian passports by certain European countries, including Switzerland, is announced in the itinerary of a travel agency whose advertising has been published in Rhodesia.

"The Swiss authorities do agree to admit holders of Rhodesian passports into Switzerland. In so doing, they are acting in accordance with the practice of accepting the validity of such documents delivered by a country's authorities, even when the country is not recognized by Switzerland. Such documents are in fact merely travel documents attesting that their holders are permitted to return to the issuing country."

7. At its 277th meeting the Committee decided to send a note to Switzerland stating that Switzerland's position with regard to Southern Rhodesian passports, as explained in its reply dated 1 June 1976, appeared to be a contradiction of its undertaking to respect the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), and that the Committee hoped that Switzerland would reconsider its position since, as far as the United Nations was concerned, acceptance of Southern Rhodesian passports was a violation of its sanctions policy. The note would also express the Committee's hope that the Swiss authorities would take the matter into consideration when reviewing Swiss sanctions policy.

8. In the absence of a reply from Portugal within the prescribed period of two months the Committee included that Government in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 August 1976.

9. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Portugal announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.

10. Further to paragraph 6 above, the proposed note was sent to Switzerland on 24 August 1976.

11. On 21 September 1976, the Chairman met with the Chargé d'affaires of Portugal and later with the Foreign Minister of Portugal and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meetings, see the Chairman's report to the Committee reproduced in annex I to the present report.

12. Subsequently, a comprehensive communication dated 14 October 1976 was received from Portugal in which reference was made to this and the other cases mentioned in the Chairman's note to Portugal of 13 August 1976, as well as to Case No. 173. For the relevant portion of the communication, see paragraph 7 of (160) Case No. 173 above.

13. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 12 November 1976.

(236) Case No. 275. Visit to Southern Rhodesia by travel agents from the United States: information obtained from published sources

1. At the 275th meeting on 16 July 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to information from published sources concerning the reported visit to Southern Rhodesia of travel agents from the United States. The information was contained in a transcript of a radio broadcast from Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, the text of which he read to the Committee and is reproduced below.

Excerpts from "Radio Newsreel" item, Salisbury Radio, 10 June 1976

"A group of American travel agents has recently visited Victoria Falls. While at the Falls, they spoke to the Minister of Information, Immigration and Tourism, Mr. Elly Broomberg.

"Q(uestion): 'Mr. Minister, due to adverse publicity received through the overseas press, do you feel that tourism from America has been dropping recently and is perhaps going to drop in the future?

"A(nswer): 'Well, it has dropped. What is going to happen in the future is hard to say. But I do know that an occasion such as we had here last night (10 June) with the 154 New Yorkers in the travel game here in Victoria Falls, all terribly enthusiastic, all of them assuring us that they are going to send tourists to Rhodesia ... '".

2. The attention of the representative of the United States was drawn to that information with a request that appropriate investigations of the matter be made.
3. The representative of the United States said that his Government would investigate the matter.
4. At the 277th meeting the representative of the United States made a statement concerning several cases under consideration. The text of that part of the statement pertaining to this case is reproduced in paragraph 4 of (189) Case No. 216 above.

O. OTHER CASES

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

See annex IV.

(238) Case No. 154. "Tango Romeo" - Sanctions-breaking activities via Gabon: information obtained from published sources and supplied by the United Kingdom on 30 August 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 13 January 1976 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigation conducted in pursuance of the Secretary-General's request formulated in [the Secretary-General's] note of 21 July 1975 has established that an aircraft, type DC-8, belonging to the Gabonese airline company Affretair called at Schiphol airport (Amsterdam) in February 1974, where it underwent repairs. As these repairs were executed on the tarmac of the airport and not in a hangar, the airport authorities were not involved in the matter. Neither did the Netherlands airline companies KLM and Martinair, both of which service aircraft of the type DC-8, have anything to do with these repairs. For this reason the Netherlands authorities do not have any documents or other evidence at their disposal that could indicate the character of the repairs or the manner in which they were executed."

4. In the absence of replies from Gabon, Malawi, Portugal, South Africa, Zaire and Zambia the Committee again included those Governments in the ninth quarterly list which was issued as a press release on 6 April 1976.
5. By a note dated 9 April 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning the activities of Affretair, the airline based in Gabon and believed by the Committee to be operating for the benefit of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom, with reference to their note of 28 November 1975, wish to inform the Committee that they have now received further information concerning the activities of the Compagnie gabonaise d'Affrètements aériens (Affretair), BP 484 Libreville: an airline registered in Gabon but known to be operating for the benefit of Southern Rhodesia.

"Affretair, although registered in Gabon, is in fact a cover organization for the Rhodesia airline Air Trans-Africa (ATA) and is controlled from Salisbury by the director of ATA, Mr. John Victor ("Jack") Malloch. Affretair has no independent existence and its aircraft and staff are those of Air Trans-Africa. In recent months the company have extended their activities and Affretair aircraft have been observed using the facilities of a large number of airports around the world.

"Affretair operates at least five aircraft: two DC-8s, registration number TR-LVK and TR-LQR, two DC-7s and one CL-44, registration number TR-LVO. These aircraft have been obtained from a number of sources. The most recently acquired DC-8 was purchased from Pomair of Belgium. The CL-44 was purchased late in 1975 from Cargo-Lux of Luxembourg and planes have also been obtained in the United States.

"Affretair aircraft operate regularly on a number of established routes. They are all freight carriers although a few passengers have been seen on certain planes. The DC-8s operate the longer routes, flying from Salisbury first to Libreville or Abidjan with cargoes of Rhodesian meat, and thence to Amsterdam via Palma de Mallorca. Freight loaded in Amsterdam destined for Rhodesia is consigned to Libreville and then overcarried. From Amsterdam certain flights operate to Asuncion, returning via Libreville with cargoes of meat from South America. There are also regular flights to Johannesburg. The CL-44 operates on the shorter routes, carrying cargoes of fresh meat to destinations within Africa. It has frequently been seen unloading meat at the airports of Lubumbashi in Zaire and Franceville and Port Gentil in Gabon.

"Affretair has also undertaken charter work for other airlines and in many cases these operations have been subsidized by the illegal régime in Rhodesia to make them competitive. Under charter to Sabena, Affretair aircraft have been seen in Brussels, Geneva, Zurich, Palma de Mallorca, Kano, Lagos and Kigali. Under charter to Air France, they have been seen in Paris (Orly), Geneva, Zurich, Palma de Mallorca, Pointe à Pitre (Guadaloupe), Lagos, Nairobi, Djibouti, Dubai and Karachi.

"For maintenance, the DC-8s fly to Charles de Gaulle airport in Paris where they are serviced by the French airline, Union de Transports Aériens SA (UTA). The CL-44 is maintained by the suppliers, Cargo-Lux, who also provide crew training in Luxembourg. The same firm supplied spare parts and engineering assistance when the CL-44 was damaged in a landing accident in the latter part of 1975, and have also supplied a replacement engine for the plane.

"The staff of Affretair, including operations and management staff, number between 125 and 150. This number includes 50-60 pilots, 15-20 flight engineers and about 30 ground engineers. Some crews are kept in Amsterdam but the majority are based in Palma de Mallorca. All staff are of European extraction and are mainly of Rhodesian, South African or British nationality, but there are also a few from France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States. Any British nationals employed by Affretair, and who are known to the Government of the United Kingdom, are subject to passport and travel restrictions.

"Apart from the office in Libreville, which is the ostensible headquarters of the company, Affretair have permanent representatives in Paris, Amsterdam, Palma de Mallorca and Johannesburg. The Affretair representative in Paris is M. Claude Milan. It was M. Milan who arranged the purchase of a DC-8 from Pomair, and he is also responsible for negotiating much of the charter work. In this latter capacity he approached the Department of Trade in the United Kingdom in October 1975 to seek permission for an extension of Affretair operations to Hong Kong, but was advised that the United Kingdom Government would have no dealings with Affretair. Another

important Affretair contact in Paris is M. Max Dumas of the Office Rhodesien d'Information, 3rd floor, 110 rue de la Boetie. Affretair's manager in Amsterdam is Mr. Ben Barto and in Palma de Mallorca the company's affairs are handled by Estelair, run by Mr. Tony Estela.

"The activities of Affretair are vital to the illegal régime in Salisbury, since by its considerable exports of Rhodesian meat and by its charter activities for other airlines, Affretair is a major earner of foreign currency which the illegal régime need in order to pay for their clandestine imports.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Governments of Belgium, France, Gabon, the Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Spain and Zaire so that those countries may take such action as may be necessary to prevent Affretair aircraft operating within their territories to the benefit of Southern Rhodesia, and to ensure that persons and firms within their territories do not, by activities in connexion with Affretair, render direct or indirect assistance to the illegal régime.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to draw the above information to the attention of all Member States with the request that they deny use of their airports and entry into their air space to Affretair aircraft because of their activities on behalf of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Government of the United Kingdom also wish to inform the Committee that in July 1975 Mr. D. J. B. Fletcher, Commerical Director of Affretair, accompanied by the Chief Pilot, Captain C. T. Miller, approached the Civil Aviation authorities in Hong Kong about the possibility of making non-scheduled cargo charter flights from Hong Kong. Permission was sought for flights from Hong Kong to Amsterdam on 6 September and from Hong Kong to Lagos on 7 October. In keeping with the terms of the Secretary-General's note of 31 December 1973, permission for these flights was refused.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to draw this further information to the attention of all Member States so that, in accordance with operative paragraph 5 (b) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), they can take all possible measures to prevent the entry into their territories of Mr. Fletcher and Captain Miller and also Mr. Malloch and his co-director, Brigadier Andrew Dunlop. Mr. Malloch was born 8 October 1920 at Durban, South Africa, and may be travelling on a South African passport. Brigadier Andrew Dunlop DSO was born at Calicut, India, on 2 February 1907. Desmond John Bain Fletcher was born on 21 October 1943 at Salisbury, Rhodesia, and Captain Colin Thomas Miller was born on 28 February 1935 at Bulawayo, Rhodesia."

6. The case was considered at the 268th meeting on 5 May 1976, at which the Committee decided that appropriate notes should be prepared under the no-objection procedure for transmission to Belgium and the Netherlands, regarding the servicing of an aircraft belonging to Affretair at Schipol Airport in the Netherlands. The Committee also decided that appropriate special reminders should similarly be

prepared for transmission to those countries which had failed to reply to notes from the Committee in the Tango Romeo case, namely, Gabon, Malawi, Portugal, South Africa, Zaire and Zambia. At the request of the Committee, the Chairman would also make personal contact with the permanent representatives of the countries concerned and would use the opportunity to impress upon them the gravity of the Committee's concern.

7. At the 269th meeting on 13 May 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that the Gabonese press had announced on 6 May 1976 that the company Affretair had been dissolved and was being incorporated in Air Gabon and that Affretair would be compensated. It was decided at that meeting that the Chairman should be requested, during his personal meeting with the Permanent Representative of Gabon, to seek confirmation of the report and clarification of what had been done or was being envisaged; the Chairman would also express the Committee's concern about violation of sanctions that might result from the payment of compensation, if the report was confirmed.

8. Further to paragraph 5 above, in accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 14 May 1976 were sent to the States primarily concerned, namely Belgium, France, Gabon, the Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Spain and Zaire, and a note dated 18 May 1976 was sent to all the other Member States, in each case transmitting the United Kingdom note and drawing attention to the appropriate paragraphs of the United Kingdom note, as indicated therein.

9. Further to paragraph 6 above, notes dated 1 June 1976 were sent, under the no-objection procedure, to Belgium, Gabon, Malawi, the Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa, Zaire and Zambia, as proposed.

10. Replies dated 16 June and 22 June 1976 to the Secretary-General's note dated 14 May 1976 were received from the Netherlands and Luxembourg respectively, the substantive parts of which read as follows.

(i) Letter dated 16 June 1976 from the Netherlands

"The Netherlands authorities have continuously followed the activities of the Gabonese airline company Affretair with the greatest possible vigilance. As was already reported in note No. 8351 of 10 December 1975, no indications whatsoever were found that goods were being transported from the Netherlands via Gabon to Southern Rhodesia. According to the latest information this airline company has ceased to exist as of 5 May 1976."

(ii) Letter dated 22 June 1976 from Luxembourg

"The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has most carefully considered the facts set forth in the above-mentioned note of 9 April 1976 in so far as they concern relations between Affretair and the Luxembourg Airline Cargolux.

"The facts stated in this context prove to be correct: the CL-44 aircraft, registration TR-LVO, was sold by Cargolux to Affretair towards the end of 1975 and a maintenance contract for that aircraft was also concluded.

"The Government of Luxembourg, while confirming these facts, nevertheless wishes to point out that the contracts in question were concluded in absolute good faith by the Luxembourg airline with an opposite number which derived its status from Gabonese law and which there was no reason to suspect of having commercial relations with Southern Rhodesia. Nor, at any time during the term of the maintenance contract, did Cargolux learn of the existence of such relations. Thus, there can be no question of any possible liability on the part of the Luxembourg airline.

"According to recent information from Gabon, Affretair has in the meantime been taken over by Air Gabon, the Gabonese national airline, and the legal existence of Affretair has thus terminated.

"That being so, the note of 9 April 1976 becomes nugatory in relation to the company principally concerned.

"The Government of Luxembourg, while not being in possession of precise information on the matter, believes that this development is due to the intervention of the Gabonese authorities, who must quite rightly have reacted to the complaints about Affretair because of the primary and principal responsibility they bear in this case by reason of the nationality of the airline in question.

"For the rest, the Government of the Grand Duchy has requested Cargolux, if and when arrangements for maintenance are contemplated with Air Gabon for the CL-44 aircraft previously sold to Affretair, to obtain appropriate assurances that the aircraft will not be operated to the benefit of Southern Rhodesia."

11. An acknowledgement dated 16 June 1976 to the Secretary-General's note of 1 June 1976 was received from Gabon.
12. A reply dated 20 July 1976 to the Secretary-General's note of 1 June 1976 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Netherlands authorities regret not being able to report any new findings.

"With regard to the repairs that the Affretair aircraft, type DC-8, underwent on the tarmac of Schipol airport in February 1974. In his note No. 13 of 13 January 1976 the Permanent Representative has explained already why the Netherlands authorities had no documents or other evidence at their disposal that could indicate the character of the repairs or the manner in which they were executed. The Netherlands authorities fear that all possibilities for further investigation of this matter are now fully exhausted."
13. Further to paragraph 4 above the Committee again included Gabon, Malawi, Portugal, South Africa, Zaire and Zambia in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 August 1976.
14. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 268th meeting as indicated in paragraph 6 above, the Chairman planned to bring up this case during his meetings with the Permanent Representatives of Gabon, Malawi, Portugal, South Africa and

Zambia, while implementing the Committee's other decision at the 273rd meeting (see para. 1 of the Chairman's report in annex I to the present report). In the case of Zaire the Chairman intended to contact the Permanent Representative of that country specifically.

15. The Chairman met with the Permanent Representatives of Gabon and Malawi, and initially with the Chargé d'affaires of Portugal and later with the Foreign Minister of Portugal individually and discussed the case with them. An account of those meetings is contained in the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I to the present report. At the time of preparation of the present report the proposed meetings between the Chairman and the representatives of South Africa, Zaire and Zambia had not yet taken place.

16. Subsequently, replies were received from Gabon and Portugal as indicated below.

(i) Substantive part of the note dated 25 September 1976 from Gabon, also covering Case Nos. 61, 232 and INGO-9

"Further to our conversation last month, I have the honour to confirm the following:

1. The aviation company concerned has been dissolved.
2. I know nothing about the compensation which was mentioned to you.
3. For several months Gabon has been holding talks with other African countries with a view to obtaining a supply of meat.

As you can see, the Gabonese Government is making obvious and appreciable efforts in more than one connexion."

(ii) Comprehensive communication dated 14 October 1976 from Portugal in which reference was made to this and the other cases mentioned in the Chairman's note to Portugal of 13 August 1976, as well as to Case No. 173 /For the relevant portion of the communication see para. 7 of (160) Case No. 173 above./

17. The case was discussed at the 280th meeting, at which the Committee decided that further inquiries should be made of Gabon with regard to the dissolution of Affretair. In particular, the Committee decided that the Government of Gabon should be requested to ascertain, as a matter of urgency, what cash sum, if any, was involved in compensation, to whom payment had been made, and what had become of Affretair's equipment subsequent to the company's dissolution. The Committee also wished to be informed further of the reasons why Gabon obtained its meat supplies from Southern Rhodesia, the quantities of meat received, the payments involved and the expected duration of that situation. With regard to the other countries involved in Case No. 154, the Committee decided that reminders should be sent to Malawi and Portugal, and that the Chairman should be urged to call on the Permanent Representatives of South Africa, Zaire and Zambia in pursuance of the decision taken at the 268th meeting.

18. On closer examination, however, it was noted that the information contained in the Chairman's report (see annex I to the present report) and subsequently

further amplified by Malawi's note dated 27 September 1976 (see para. 7 of (234) Case No. 213 above) set forth Malawi's peculiar difficulties in joining the trade boycott of Southern Rhodesia. Since Malawi has informed the Committee by its note indicated above that air services, as well as external trade links, between Malawi and Southern Rhodesia had been severed, and similarly, in view of the changed status of the authorities in Angola and Mozambique, and bearing in mind the position of the new Government of Portugal on such matters (see para. 16 (ii) above), the Committee at the time of preparation of the present report, was in the process of reconsidering this aspect of its decisions at the 280th meeting, under which reminders would be sent to Malawi and Portugal. Implementation of the other relevant decisions, however, was under way.

19. In the absence of a reply from Belgium within the prescribed period of two months the Committee included that Government and, further to paragraph 13 above, again South Africa, Zaire and Zambia in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

(239) Case No. 155. Cameras from Switzerland: United Kingdom note dated 27 September 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the report is given below.
3. The case was considered at the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, at which the Committee decided that the matter should be deferred until any further information, if available, was submitted by the United Kingdom Government, for the benefit of the Swiss investigating authorities.

(240) Case No. 158. Pine oil from the United States - "Charlotte Lykes": United Kingdom note dated 19 October 1973

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

(241) Case No. 159. Cardboard containers from Spain: United Kingdom note dated 12 November 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 271st meeting, a note dated 24 June 1976 was sent to Spain, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"At its 271st meeting, the Committee considered the above-mentioned case and it had before it His Excellency's note dated 16 June 1975. While expressing its gratitude for the co-operation of His Excellency's Government, it felt that further information on the case should be sought from the Government. In particular, it wished to know the nature of investigations undertaken by the Spanish authorities on the basis of which they had concluded that no evidence could be found that the cardboard containers in question had been to Southern Rhodesia. Furthermore the Committee would welcome assurance from the Spanish company concerned that it did not export any such cardboard containers to Southern Rhodesia. The Committee felt that the information contained in the United Kingdom note of November 1973 could provide a useful basis for securing the further information now sought.

"The Committee would welcome receiving a reply from His Excellency's Government at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

(242) Case No. 201. Danish trade with Southern Rhodesia: information submitted by Denmark

See annex IV.

(243) Case No. 210. Supply of various items of miscellaneous equipment to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 24 June 1975

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the report is given below.
3. First, second and third reminders were sent to Israel on 26 December 1975, 26 January and 1 March 1976, respectively.
4. A reply dated 29 March was received from Israel, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"With regard to Case 210, the Department of Customs and Excise has investigated the allegations contained in the above-mentioned note of the Secretary-General and found, beyond any shadow of a doubt, that there is no record of such transactions having taken place, and in view of the fact that the Department of Customs and Excise scrupulously observes the standing order issued with respect of trade with Southern Rhodesia, it is reasonable to assume that no such exportation as referred to in the above-mentioned note has taken place. Furthermore, it should be noted that in an inquiry with the Israeli companies concerned it was substantiated that no such exportation has taken place."

(244) Case No. 214. Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by Switzerland

See annex IV.

(245) Case No. 218. Southern Rhodesia and the International Chamber of Commerce Congress: information obtained from published sources

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the report is given below.
3. First, second and third reminders were sent to Spain on 12 February, 8 April and 10 May 1976, respectively.
4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Spain announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss this case in connexion with which a reply was still pending after three reminders.
5. An acknowledgement dated 17 August 1976 was received from Spain to the Chairman's note of 13 August 1976.
6. On 13 September 1976, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Spain and discussed the case in question.

7. A letter dated 14 September 1976 addressed to the Chairman was received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Further to our conversation of 13 September 1976 concerning Case No. 218, I have the honour to transmit to you a list of the names of the Rhodesian businessmen who attended the Twenty-fifth Annual International Congress of Chambers of Commerce in Madrid from 15 to 22 June 1975.

"The list, supplied by the Madrid Chamber of Commerce and Industry, is as follows:

Burningham, Ralph
Crookes, Kenneim
Daffy, Michael
van Heerden, James
Maltas, George
Mucheche, Martin
Sly, Richard
Stewart, Douglas
Thompson, Andrew

"It has not yet been possible to obtain particulars of the travel documents used by these persons. An initial inquiry to the staff of the International Chamber of Commerce in Paris yielded no results. Although the investigations by the competent authorities in Spain are continuing, it must be borne in mind that there are more than 30 million visitors to Spain every year, which means additional difficulty in view of the time that has elapsed. Nevertheless, the Spanish authorities are confident they will be able to identify the travel documents used by these persons."

(246) Case No. 233. Supply of chemical substances to Southern Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 1 December 1975

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of the report is given below.
3. A reply dated 13 January 1976 was received from Israel, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that after the necessary investigations had been carried out, no confirmation of the allegations made in the said note of the United Kingdom was obtained."

4. A note dated 16 March 1976 was sent to Israel, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee considered the reply from His Excellency's Government dated 13 January 1976 relating to the Committee's inquiries into the possibility that quantities of chemical substances were being supplied to Southern Rhodesia by an Israeli concern known as Narex Middle East Co., Ltd., of Tel Aviv.

"While expressing its appreciation for the reply thus received, the Committee considered that to fulfil its mandate as established by the Security Council, it would be necessary for it to receive additional information on the means used by the authorities in reaching the conclusion that no confirmation of the allegation that the Israeli company cited above was supplying goods to Southern Rhodesia was obtained. Therefore, the Committee asked the Secretary-General to request the Israeli Government to pursue the matter further and to transmit to the Committee any additional information which may come to light, together with copies of the documentation on the basis of which the investigating authorities have established their findings.

"The Committee also indicated that it would appreciate receiving a reply at the earliest convenience from His Excellency's Government, if possible within one month."

5. A reply dated 11 May 1976 was received from Israel, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Department of Customs and Excise was instructed again to investigate the allegation that quantities of chemical substances were being supplied to Southern Rhodesia by the Israeli concern known as Marex East Company Ltd., and has found that there is no basis for such an allegation. In this connexion, it should be stressed once more that the Israeli Department of Customs and Excise is instructed not to permit, in any manner, any exportation to, or importation from, Southern Rhodesia of any commodities at all."

(247) Case No. 243. Federal Republic of Germany trade with Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by the Federal Republic of Germany

See annex IV below.

(248) Case No. 247. Chemical products - trade with Southern Rhodesia by a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany: United Kingdom note dated 23 February 1976

1. By a note dated 23 February 1976 the United Kingdom reported information concerning the possibility that a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany has been trading with Southern Rhodesia. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wishes to inform the Committee that they have received information of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation that a firm in the Federal Republic of Germany has been trading with Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that between 1 December 1975 and 31 January 1976 Nordmann Rassmann and Co. of Hamburg, in the Federal Republic of Germany, sold 80 tons of the chemical Sorbitol 70% to KDB Holdings (Pvt) Ltd., 212/3 Sarum House, Manica Road, Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of the Federal Republic of

Germany in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Nordmann Rassmann and Co. may be trading with Rhodesia."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 5 March 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.
3. A first reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 10 May 1976.
4. A reply dated 10 May 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations, with reference to the Secretary General's note of 5 March 1976, has the honour to communicate the following:

"In the middle of March, an external trade audit focusing on all export transactions to South Africa and Southern Rhodesia was carried out at the firm of Nordmann, Rassmann and Co., Hamburg.

"The books showed that during the period under investigation (1 January 1974-18 March 1976) the company's total exports to that region consisted of two lots of methapyrilene sold to Southern Rhodesia. The export to Southern Rhodesia of methapyrilene is not subject to licensing under the Foreign Trade Ordinance of the Federal Republic of Germany because it serves humanitarian (medical) purposes.

"The audit did not confirm the assumption that the company sold 80 tons of Sorbitol to Southern Rhodesia between 1 December 1975 and 31 January 1976."

5. The Committee considered the reply from the Federal Republic of Germany at the 281st meeting on 24 November 1976 and decided that a further note should be sent to that Government thanking it for the investigation already carried out and requesting it to ask the firm concerned whether it had sold the chemical in question to anyone between the dates indicated. At the time of preparation of the present report, action on the Committee's decision was under way.

(249) Case No. 259. Violation of sanctions by a firm in the United Kingdom:
United Kingdom note dated 2 April 1976

1. By a note dated 2 April 1976, the United Kingdom reported information concerning the successful prosecution of a United Kingdom subsidiary of a foreign company under the United Kingdom legislation giving effect to Security Council resolution 253 (1968). The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee of a further successful prosecution that has been brought under the United Kingdom legislation which gives effect to Security Council resolution 253 (1968), that is to say, the Southern Rhodesia (United Nations Sanctions) (No. 2) Order 1968. This prosecution, in which the defendants were the United Kingdom subsidiary of a foreign company and a British member of its staff, was heard at the Middlesex Guildhall Crown Court on 19 December 1975.

"CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd. (a subsidiary company of VEB Carl Zeiss Jena, of the German Democratic Republic), and Harold George Gibson (a sales manager) were each charged with having supplied or delivered goods to Ozalid South Africa (Pty), Ltd; knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that the goods would be delivered to, or to the order of, a person in Southern Rhodesia, namely the Surveyor-General. The goods in question were a topographical plotting instrument, known as a Topocart B with Orthophot (value about £20,000), and ancillary equipment including a model corrector (value about £1,200).

"The sale was negotiated in 1972 by Mr. Gibson, then Manager of the Photogrammetric Division of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd; with a representative of the Surveyor-General's office in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia. As the function of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., is to sell equipment manufactured by its parent company in the German Democratic Republic, the Topocart B with Orthophot was supplied from store in Rotterdam, Netherlands, having arrived there direct from the German Democratic Republic. The model corrector was supplied from stock held in the United Kingdom and was exported in November 1973. This equipment was invoiced to Ozalid Co., Ltd., in the United Kingdom but was shipped by CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., to Ozalid's parent company, Ozalid South Africa (Pty), Ltd. There is no evidence to suggest that the Ozalid Co., Ltd., knew the ultimate destination of the goods.

"Both CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., and Mr. Gibson pleaded guilty to this charge. The company was fined £5000 and ordered to pay £200 prosecution costs. Mr. Gibson was sentenced to a fine of £250 or three months' imprisonment in default of payment.

"It became clear during the court proceedings that the Managing Director of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., at the time of the offences, Mr. Dieter Fuchs, also had knowledge of the offences. As Mr. Fuchs is a citizen of the German Democratic Republic and had returned there before the case was heard, it was not, however, possible for the United Kingdom authorities to interview him in connexion with this matter.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above to the attention of the Government of the German Democratic Republic. The Secretary-General may further wish to suggest to the Government of the German Democratic Republic that, with a view to their taking the appropriate enforcement action, they should interview Mr. Dieter Fuchs and the management of VEB Carl Zeiss Jena and should generally investigate the role which they played in this illegal transaction."

2. At the 265th meeting on 5 April 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement on the matter in which he said that, with reference to the note from his delegation announcing the prosecution of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., for exporting certain cartographic material to Southern Rhodesia through South Africa, he wished to draw attention to the fact that the parent company of the United Kingdom subsidiary was VEB Carl Zeiss Jena of the German Democratic Republic. As the managing director of the subsidiary company at the time of the offence had returned to the German Democratic Republic before the case had been heard in court, his delegation felt that it would be useful if the Secretary-General could be

requested to seek, in the usual manner, further information in that respect from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 267th meeting, a note dated 30 April 1976, the text of which was adopted by the Committee at that meeting, was sent to the German Democratic Republic, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting that Government to undertake the necessary investigation of the facts set out in the United Kingdom note and to inform the Committee of the results in order to facilitate the examination of the question by the Committee.

4. An acknowledgement dated 10 May 1976 was received from the German Democratic Republic, followed by a reply dated 23 June 1976, the substantive part of which read as follows:

"In pursuance of its principled policy to support the just struggle of the oppressed peoples against colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and the policy of apartheid, the German Democratic Republic has denied the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia any recognition and does not maintain any diplomatic, political, economic or other relations with this régime. It is consistently supporting the demand for the implementation of the right of self-determination for the people of Zimbabwe. The provisions of Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) are strictly observed by all natural and juridical persons who are under GDR jurisdiction.

"Immediately after receipt of the above-mentioned note the Government of the GDR charged the competent authorities to carry out a comprehensive investigation based on the legal regulations of the GDR which prohibit any relations with the racist minority régime.

"In order to clarify the legal and factual relations existing between the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena and the British enterprise CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., the following must be stated:

"Between the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena and the CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., London there do not exist any relations in terms of instruction, subordination or supervision but there are simply business relations. Their commercial relations are those as exist between seller and buyer and are regulated on the basis of sales contracts.

"The legal position of ownership regarding the CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., is such that the majority of the capital shares are in possession of nationals of the United Kingdom. The CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., is a legally independent enterprise established under British law and responsible for its own commercial transactions. In this context, the Government of the GDR wishes to point out that the remaining capital shares are not held by the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena, as is wrongly supposed, but are owned by GDR citizens.

"Within the framework of the sales contracts concluded between the two enterprises, the CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., is not obliged to make known the names of the ultimate buyers or the contracts of the CZ, Ltd., with their customers to the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena.

"The assertion that the enterprise in London was an affiliated company to the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena is therefore unfounded.

"Regarding the case dealt with in the note of the Government of the United Kingdom, the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena did not have knowledge of the intention of its business associate, CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., London, to have the goods sent on to Southern Rhodesia. In view of the exclusively commercial nature of its relations with the enterprise in London, the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena could not obtain such knowledge at all. All these facts prove that the reproach directed against the VEB Carl Zeiss Jena is unfounded.

"As requested in the note of the Government of the United Kingdom to the Security Council Committee concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, the Government of the German Democratic Republic gave instruction immediately to investigate the involvement of the then managing director of the CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., the GDR citizen Herr Fuchs, and can communicate the following:

"During his term as managing director of the enterprise in London Herr Fuchs neither arranged for, nor agreed to or confirmed the said transaction with Southern Rhodesia.

"The entire investigation of the conduct of the then managing director, Herr Fuchs, did not provide any indication that he had knowledge of the delivery of goods to natural or juridical persons of Southern Rhodesia.

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic avails itself of this opportunity to reassure that the GDR will also in future strictly observe all sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia by the United Nations Security Council."

5. The Committee considered the matter at the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976 and noted the apparent conflict between the information given by the German Democratic Republic and the original report given by the United Kingdom.
6. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his delegation had no further information on the case as yet but had full confidence in the judicial proceedings which had led to the development of the information contained in the original note from the United Kingdom.
7. The Committee decided that a note should be prepared for transmission to the United Kingdom, bringing to the attention of the Government the reply from the German Democratic Republic and requesting any additional information that might help to reconcile the positions expressed by the two Governments.
8. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the same meeting, a note dated 26 August 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom, bringing to the attention of the Government the reply from the German Democratic Republic and requesting any additional information that might help to reconcile the positions expressed by the two Governments.
9. A reply dated 28 October 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The United Kingdom authorities have made the following comments on the relationship existing between VEB Carl Zeiss Jena and CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd.

"(a) The Directors of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., on 27 September 1976 were as follows:

- (i) Carlotta Kenmore (UK)
- (ii) Stephen Kenmore (UK)
- (iii) Kurt Buettner (GDR)
- (iv) Siegfried Huches (GDR)
- (v) Gunter Gruenewald (GDR)

"(b) Herr Buettner and Herr Huches are both Directors of VEB Carl Zeiss Jena.

"(c) According to CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd.'s directors report dated 31 December 1973, the company had bank overdrafts of £299,538 guaranteed by VEB Carl Zeiss Jena.

"(d) The issued capital of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., on 27 September 1976 was £30,000. Among the principal shareholders at this time were:

- (i) Henrich Winkler (6000 £1 shares)
- (ii) Werner Pfeutzenreuter (6000 £1 shares)
- (iii) Emil Lauff (2997 £1 shares)

All three gentlemen listed their place of residence as Jena, GDR, and are presumably GDR nationals.

"(e) The Managing Director of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., at the time of the admitted breach of sanctions was Herr Dieter Fuchs, a GDR national.

"In the view of the Government of the United Kingdom, the above points strongly indicate a significant relationship between VEB Carl Zeiss Jena and CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd.

"The Government of the United Kingdom would further like to point out that it would be most unusual for the Managing Director of CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., not to be aware of the fact that the manager of his Photogrammetric Division (Mr. Gibson) had travelled to Southern Rhodesia on business. It will be recalled that both Mr. Gibson and CZ Scientific Instruments, Ltd., pleaded guilty under sanctions legislation and that it was stated on behalf of CZ in court that Herr Fuchs was the principal culprit. No action could be taken in England against Mr. Fuchs as he returned to the GDR before the case was heard."

10. The matter was considered by the Committee again at the 278th meeting, and it was decided that the information received from the United Kingdom in its note of 28 October 1976 should be transmitted to the German Democratic Republic with a request for the Government's comments thereon. It was also decided that the text of the transmittal note should be submitted to the Committee for consideration at the following meeting.

11. Accordingly, the text of the transmittal note was submitted to the Committee and was adopted at the 279th meeting on 11 November 1976. Consequently, the United Kingdom note of 28 October 1976 was transmitted to the German Democratic Republic on 15 November 1976.

(250) Case No. 261. Trade with Southern Rhodesia by an Italian firm: United Kingdom note dated 5 May 1976

1. By a note dated 5 May 1976, the United Kingdom reported information to the effect that an Italian firm has been trading with Southern Rhodesia and that a Swiss company has also been concerned in the transaction. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information, of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation, that an Italian firm has been trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that between 1 November 1975 and 31 January 1976 Montedison Fibre SpA of Milan delivered a consignment of 20 tons of nylon valued at US dollars 46,000 to Security Mills (Pvt), Ltd., of Bulawayo in Southern Rhodesia. Payment for this consignment was made through Atlas Trading of Switzerland. The nylon, which was shipped to Durban, was invoiced and delivered to Security Mills (Pvt), Ltd., of Johannesburg for subsequent trans-shipment to Bulawayo. The information indicates, however, that the arrangements for this transaction were made directly with the Rhodesian office of Security Mills (Pvt), Ltd., by Signor M. Bini of Montedison Fibre SpA.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Italy to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Montedison Fibre SpA are trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring the above information to the attention of the Government of Switzerland in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that a Swiss company has been concerned in the supply of nylon to Southern Rhodesia."

2. In accordance with the Committee's standard practice under the no-objection procedure, notes dated 20 May 1976 were sent to Italy and Switzerland, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. An acknowledgement dated 17 June 1976 was received from Switzerland.

4. A reply was received from Italy dated 8 July 1976, transmitting to the Committee a copy of the original letter the Italian Government had received from the Italian company mentioned in the United Kingdom note, together with a translation of that letter into English, and copies of the documents mentioned therein. The substantive part of the reply from Italy reads as follows:

"The note by the Government of the United Kingdom, enclosed with the Secretary-General's communication, submitted to the Committee a complaint against the Italian Company Montefibre SpA of Milan as to a transaction of 20 tons of 'nylon 66' allegedly exported to Southern Rhodesia.

"The Italian Government has brought this complaint to the attention of the above-mentioned company whose reply is herewith enclosed."

Enclosure

Letter dated 19 May 1976 from Montefibre SpA

"The undersigned company Montefibre SpA, with its principal office in Milan (Italy), 14 Via Pola has been informed by the Italian Foreign Ministry that the United Kingdom Government has submitted to the United Nations Sanctions Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) a complaint against said company as to a transaction of 20 tons of nylon 66 allegedly exported to Southern Rhodesia.

"The complained facts are the following:

- "(1) Montefibre SpA is supposed to have shipped and delivered 20 tons of nylon valued at US\$ 46.000 to Security Mills (PVT), Ltd., of Bulawayo in Southern Rhodesia;
- "(2) The payment for the delivered goods is supposed to have been made through Atlas Trading of Lausanne (Switzerland);
- "(3) The nylon, shipped to Durban, is supposed to have been invoiced and delivered to Security Mills (PVT), Ltd., of Johannesburg for subsequent trans-shipment to Bulawayo;
- "(4) Mr. Mauro Bini of Montefibre SpA is supposed to have carried out the transaction directly with the Rhodesian Office of Security Mills (PVT), Ltd.

"In first instance the undersigned Montefibre SpA acknowledges the following:

- "(1) It did not export its goods to Southern Rhodesia;
- "(2) It is not aware that goods sold by it in Italy or abroad have been subsequently delivered to Southern Rhodesia.

"Particularly as far as the denounced facts are concerned, Montefibre SpA clarifies the following:

- "(a) At the International Exhibition of Textile Machinery, that took place in Milan (Italy) in October 1975, Mister Goldwasser, on behalf of Atlas Trading of Lausanne, contacted the Overseas Countries Export Office of Montefibre SpA, to which Mr. Mauro Bini is assigned, to negotiate the purchase of 20 tons of nylon 66 f.o.b. Italian port. On that occasion it was specified that the goods' destination would be Durban (South Africa) and the transaction under this condition was agreed upon;
- "(b) Afterwards the parties focused the usual commercial terms in order to establish the operative aspects of the transaction such as terms of payment, delivery, empty cogs return, etc.

"As a confirmation of what above said, the following below listed documents are herein attached:

"1. Confirmation of order No. 28100259 dated 10 October 1975;

"2. Open credit letter on the United Overseas Bank No. 68189/81176-AD dated 14 November 1975 to be cashed on Banca Ameritalia with credit No. 37710 of 18 November 1975;

"3. Montefibre invoices Nos. 5/07423 and 5/07424 of 18 December 1975;

"4. Bill of lading No. 25 of South Africa Marine Corp. dated 1 January 1976 through shipper Savino Del Bene.

"Anyhow, the Undersigned Company is at disposal for any other information necessary to better clarify its position and to confirm its extraneousness to the facts complained at international level."

5. A first reminder was sent to Switzerland on 22 July 1976.

6. An acknowledgement dated 28 July 1976 was received from Switzerland, stating that, as already indicated in the Swiss note dated 17 June 1976, the information regarding the present case had been forwarded to the competent Swiss authorities and that as soon as the results of the investigation that had been instituted were known, the Secretary-General would be informed of those results.

7. A reply dated 21 August 1976 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 and has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's notes of 20 May and 22 July 1976 in which he states that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia suggests that an inquiry be made to determine whether a Swiss company was actually implicated in a sale of nylon to Southern Rhodesia.

"In pursuance of his note of 17 June 1976 (370. Rhod. Case No. 261), the Permanent Observer can now inform the Secretary-General that the inquiries have yielded the following results:

"There is no mention of any firm by the name of 'Atlas Trading' in the Swiss trade register, which lists all persons, associations and companies engaged in any kind of commercial activity in Switzerland.

"However, two firms, whose commercial titles contain the word 'Atlas', have been invited to comment on the information provided by the Committee. These two firms have stated categorically that at no time have they been involved in the sale to Security Mills at Bulawayo of 20 tons of nylon originating from Montedison Fibre SpA at Milan.

"The federal authorities are ready at any time to re-examine this matter should the Committee be able to provide them with further information."

(251) Case No. 263. Trade with Southern Rhodesia by a Belgian firm: United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1976

1. By a note dated 26 April 1976 the United Kingdom submitted information concerning trade with Southern Rhodesia by a Belgian firm. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Committee that they have received information, of sufficient reliability to merit further investigation, that a Belgian firm has been trading with Southern Rhodesia.

"The information is to the effect that, during the months of January and February 1976, Gustav Janssens and Company of Antwerp delivered three consignments of urea totalling between 700 and 800 tons to African Explosives and Chemicals Industries of Salisbury in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggest that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to draw the above information to the attention of the Government of Belgium in order to assist them with their investigations into the possibility that Gustav Janssens and Company may be trading with Southern Rhodesia."

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 20 May 1976 was sent to Belgium transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

3. First, second and third reminders were sent to Belgium on 22 July, 24 August and 24 September 1976, respectively.

4. A reply dated 28 September 1976 was received from Belgium, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to refer to your note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 24 September 1976, Case No. 263, concerning the request by the United Kingdom that the Belgian authorities should investigate the trade relations which have allegedly been established in Rhodesia by the Belgian firm S. Janssens et Cie.

"The Belgian authorities, on the basis of the scanty information provided by the United Kingdom, have undertaken the investigation requested. The conduct of this investigation with the necessary degree of thoroughness has taken some time. The complexity of such an inquiry, which deals with exports assumed to have taken place as recently as January or February 1976, accounts for the regrettable but unintentional delay in transmitting this reply.

"With regard to the substance of this matter, the Belgian authorities have requested me to inform you that, on the basis of the information forwarded by the United Kingdom, the investigation conducted by the competent services concentrated more particularly on the months of January and February 1976.

"This investigation, which could be taken further if any new developments were to justify this step, turned up nothing to indicate that the Janssens firm has exported merchandise to Rhodesia."

(252) Case No. 272. Shipment of milk powder to Southern Rhodesia - "Tugelaland":
Federal Republic of Germany note dated 10 March 1975

1. By a note dated 10 March 1975, the Federal Republic of Germany reported information concerning an authorized shipment of milk powder from Hamburg to Beira. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Federal Republic of Germany has authorized shipment from Hamburg to Beira by the German vessel Tugelaland of three tons of milk powder which, according to the forwarded shipping documents, are a gift from the Swiss Government to the Salvation Army in aid of people in need in Southern Rhodesia. This decision is considered to be in accordance with resolution 253 (1968), paragraph 3 (d) and (e)."

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 276th meeting, a note dated 16 August 1976 was sent to Switzerland under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"In 1975, the Federal Republic of Germany reported to the Committee that it had authorized shipment from Hamburg to Beira, by the vessel Tugelaland, of three tons of milk powder which, according to the forwarded shipping documents, were a gift from the Swiss Government to the Salvation Army in aid of people in need in Southern Rhodesia. At its 276th meeting, the Committee continued its consideration of this case and decided that in order to complete its consideration of this case, it would be useful for it to receive assurance from His Excellency's Government that the distribution of the milk powder in question, once it had reached Southern Rhodesia, had in fact been in accordance with the medical, humanitarian and educational exceptions permitted under paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). In this connexion, the Committee felt that His Excellency's Government might ask the Salvation Army to provide the necessary information regarding the distribution of the milk powder and transmit the Salvation Army's reply to the Committee.

"The Committee would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter, together with the information obtained from the Salvation Army, at its earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

3. A reply dated 14 October 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note of 16 August 1976, concerning the three tons of powdered milk donated by the Swiss Government which have been distributed to needy persons in Southern Rhodesia by the Salvation Army.

"The Swiss Government makes an annual donation of a certain quantity of powdered milk to international relief organizations, among which is the World Council of Churches. The latter redistributes its share to other agencies, including the Salvation Army, which decided to pass on three tons of the milk to its representative in Salisbury.

"This agency's report on its activities shows that those who benefited from the aid were elderly persons and persons without families."

4. The case was discussed at the 281st meeting on 24 November 1976, at which the Committee decided to consider it closed.

(253) Case No. 273. Recruitment of mercenaries for Southern Rhodesia: Information obtained from published sources

1. In the course of 1975 and 1976 the Committee received information from various published sources, according to which increasing numbers of non-Southern Rhodesian citizens from abroad were being recruited to join the armed forces of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. The recruits were said to be mostly veterans of previous wars and to come mainly from Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States. One published source (22 July 1976) reported an official of the so-called New Zealand-Rhodesia Society in Auckland as saying that about 100 New Zealanders had volunteered to serve in Southern Rhodesia, of whom 20 had already left during the previous six months.

2. The Committee recalled that a statement on the matter had been made by the representative of the United States at the 245th meeting on 31 July 1975, the text of which is reproduced below:

"I refer to discussions within this Committee concerning alleged recruitment of mercenaries in the United States to fight in Southern Rhodesia.

"We are looking into this matter very closely to determine whether there has been any violation of United States law. Among relevant laws are the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the Foreign Services Enlistment Act and the Rhodesian Sanctions Regulations. Our objective is the termination of any such recruitment. In this regard, we understand that the organization in Colorado that was allegedly involved has indicated that it is no longer recruiting. We have no knowledge of any Americans serving in a military or paramilitary capacity in Rhodesia. I should add that any United States citizen who joins the armed forces of another country runs the possible risk of losing his American citizenship and would be subject to criminal prosecution under the Foreign Services Enlistment Act, which subjects those violating it to prison terms of up to three years and fines of up to \$1,000."

3. By a letter dated 23 July 1976 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, the Permanent Representative of New Zealand to the United Nations transmitted the text of a statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of New Zealand concerning the matter of the recruitment of mercenaries for Southern Rhodesia from New Zealand. The substantive part of the letter and the text of its enclosure are reproduced below.

Text of the letter

"I wish to draw to your attention a statement issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand, Hon. B. E. Talboys, on 22 July 1976 concerning the service of mercenaries in Southern Rhodesia.

"I should be grateful if you would arrange for this statement to be circulated to all members of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council."

Enclosure

Text of the statement issued by the Minister
for Foreign Affairs of New Zealand

"'Individuals who elect to join the Rhodesian forces do not have the support of the Government and cannot expect assistance in the event of their getting into difficulties,' the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hon. B. E. Talboys, said today in commenting on recent press reports of New Zealanders serving with the Armed Forces in Rhodesia.

"While the traditional freedom of movement which is the right of all New Zealanders means that there is no legal obstacle to travel to Rhodesia, the Government is naturally concerned when New Zealanders associate themselves with forces in rebellion against constitutional authority and in this case, rebellion against their sovereign, Queen Elizabeth, who is also the head of State of New Zealand. Such people would also do well to recognize that in taking such action they place themselves outside the reach of New Zealand's practical capacity to help them in case of trouble, since New Zealand does not recognize the illegal régime in Rhodesia and does not have relations with it."

4. An acknowledgement was sent to the Permanent Representative of New Zealand by the Chairman on 29 July 1976, assuring him that the matter had been placed before the Committee for its consideration.

(254) Case No. 274. Purchase of timber from Southern Rhodesia by a United Kingdom corporation: information obtained from published sources

1. At the 268th meeting on 5 May 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to an article appearing in the London Financial Times of 30 April 1976, which contained information regarding sanctions violations divulged to that newspaper by senior Southern Rhodesian officials. According to that information a United Kingdom corporation, the National Coal Board (NCB), had taken delivery of a trial consignment of 3,000 cubic feet of timber, worth £3,800, from Southern Rhodesia. r/ The deal had been negotiated by Mr. Peter McAinsh, chairman of Peter McAinsh, Ltd., a company of timber merchants established in Scotland. Mr. McAinsh was described as one of the largest suppliers of timber to the NCB. The information also indicated that, for some reason details of the transaction had been revealed by the Southern Rhodesian authorities, who had provided the following documentary evidence to the London newspaper:

(a) A letter dated 9 April 1974 to S. Goncalves e Irmao, a shipping agent in Beira, Mozambique, confirming an order for coverboards and giving details of how the consignment should be packaged as required by the NCB;

r/ An option for a standing offer for the supply of up to 5,000 cubic metres annually was also reported.

(b) A memorandum dated 9 May 1974 to the Rhodesian Wattle Co., Umtali, given as a subsidiary of the Lonrho Co., dealing with exchanges between the confirming house (in Southern Rhodesia) and the importer, Peter McAinsh, Ltd.;

(c) A letter dated 14 May 1974 from Goncalves to the importer confirming the receipt of an official NCB order for 3,000 cubic feet of wattle chocks;

(d) A letter dated 1 July 1974 from Goncalves to the importer detailing difficulties over the provision of a certificate of origin by the Mozambique authorities;

(e) A certificate of origin issued by the Associacao Commercial da Beira; and

(f) A through bill of lading issued by the Clan Line Steamers.

2. The published report quoted a spokesman for the NCB as admitting that the Board had taken delivery of 3,000 cubic feet of wattle chocks but that the consignment had been understood to have originated in Mozambique or South Africa; an international investigation would be started at once to determine how the Board had come to accept supplies which apparently had emanated from Southern Rhodesia.

3. The representative of the United Kingdom told the Committee at that meeting that the Southern Rhodesians had said that they were irritated at the "holier-than-thou" attitude of the United Kingdom Government in naming Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands in a recent note to the Committee in connexion with sanctions violations. The United Kingdom authorities were actively investigating the matter and would prosecute any wrongdoing which might have taken place. He stressed that the Southern Rhodesians had chosen to publicize a case which involved Beira transit traffic and the alleged falsification of certificates of origin in Mozambique since they had little to lose in so doing in view of the fact that the Mozambique frontier had already been closed to them. It was easy to imagine the apprehension on the part of certain undiscovered sanctions violators who might wonder when their turn might come to be sacrificed by the Southern Rhodesians in an apparent attempt to dissuade them from sending unwelcome notes to the Committee.

4. A note dated 16 August 1974 was sent to the United Kingdom inquiring whether the investigations were completed and the results could be communicated to the Committee.

5. Further information was provided to the Committee by the United Kingdom in a note dated 23 November 1976, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The National Coal Board has now completed its own investigation into the case and has examined all the relevant documentation. The Board is satisfied that at no time was any member of their purchasing staff aware that the consignment in question was of Southern Rhodesian origin as all the documentation claimed it was Mozambique timber.

"A further investigation has been carried out by HM Customs and Excise, covering both the National Coal Board and the firm of G.A. Kirkham, Ltd; who imported the balance of this particular shipment. No evidence was found of deliberate evasion of sanctions. The Customs investigation shows that

two separate entries were lodged on behalf of the importers by Aeromaritime Co (Imports), Ltd. In each case the overseas supplier was shown as S Goncalves e Irmao of Beira and the country of origin was shown as Mozambique. Payment was made direct to the supplier in Beira.

"HM Customs and Excise have not been able to interview Mr. Peter McAinsh, as they would have wished, as he left the United Kingdom in April 1976 with the reported intention of settling abroad. His destination and his present whereabouts are unknown."

(255) Case No. 276. The activities of Lonrho and other United Kingdom companies: information obtained from published sources and from non-governmental sources

1. At the 276th meeting on 22 July 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to a report appearing in The Times of London of 8 July 1976 concerning the activities of the Lonrho company and other United Kingdom firms which were allegedly infringing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. According to the newspaper account, the United Kingdom Department of Trade had recently issued a report, which had been critical of Lonrho's activities including, in particular, a suggestion that the chief executive of Lonrho had lent his authority and approval to Lonrho's subsidiaries in Southern Rhodesia. In turn, as a consequence, Lonrho had come out with revelations alleging widespread sanctions violation by major British companies including British Petroleum, Rio Tinto-zinc, Cadbury Schweppes, the Lucas Service Overseas and British Insulated Callender Cables. The newspaper account also contained a complaint said to have been made previously by the chief executive of Lonrho in correspondence that the British Government had ignored his suggestions by which the Southern Rhodesian economy would have been paralysed if the British Government had forced the closure of all British controlled banks and other companies there. It was stated that the Department of Trade's report was in the hands of the Deputy Director of Prosecutions (DPP), who had asked for an investigation into certain aspects of the Lonrho affair. The investigation was expected to take several months before a preliminary report would be ready for the DPP.

2. Previously, the Committee had received information from non-governmental sources in which the name of Lonrho had been mentioned in connexion with the activities of the Edmundian Copper Mine in Mozambique. That information alleged also that, over and above the Edmundian case, the Lonrho group was also breaking sanctions through financing the Shamrocke (Nyaschere) copper mine via Lonrho's South Africa subsidiary, HCC Investments, and during the course of other financial transactions involving its Southern Rhodesian subsidiaries and other companies based in the Bahamas, South Africa and Switzerland.

3. It was suggested that the information of the alleged activities of Lonrho should be brought to the attention of the representative of the United Kingdom, requesting his Government's comments thereon, on the basis of which the Committee might consider what further action to take with regard to the Governments of the Bahamas, South Africa and Switzerland.

4. At the 276th meeting the representative of the United Kingdom said that if the Lonrho allegations brought to the Committee's attention were true, the Committee would be confronted with what his delegation considered to be one of the most

serious violations of sanctions ever committed. He assured the Committee that the United Kingdom DPP was currently considering the Lonrho report and that it remained for the DPP to take any further action. He would be unable to provide any additional information until the DPP had completed his consideration of the report.

5. A note dated 29 November 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom inquiring whether the DPP had completed consideration of his report and the findings could be communicated to the Committee.

6. A reply dated 15 December 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The relevant United Kingdom authorities are still investigating various matters connected with the Lonrho report and are not yet in a position to submit a substantive reply to the Committee. They hope, however, to be in a position to make a further statement fairly early in 1977."

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

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

- (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 eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the matter since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision under the no-objection procedure, the letter dated 14 November 1975 a/ from the representative of the United States and its attachment were issued as a press release on 30 December 1975, and notes of inquiry were sent to the 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 14 November 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 July 1975 to 30 September 1975.

a/ See eighth report (S/11927/Add.1), annex III, paras. 7 and 8.

b/ See sixth report (S/11178/Add.1), annex II, sect. B, paras. 9 and 10.

"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), 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 July 1975 to 30 September 1975. Attached please find a list of these imports."

4. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the representative of the United States submitted to the Committee a list of shipments of chrome ore, nickel and other materials that were imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 October to 31 December 1975. c/
5. In accordance with the Committee's decision under the no-objection procedure, the information received from the representative of the United States was issued as a press release on 24 August 1976, 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 3 above.
6. Further to the discussion held at the 278th meeting d/ on 4 November 1976 regarding the question of conflicting reports of Member States on the origin of goods declared to have been imported from Southern Rhodesia, at the 282nd meeting on 9 December 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement to the Committee, the text of which is reproduced below.

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

d/ See para. 19 in volume I of the present report.

"The United States wishes to reiterate for the Committee our procedure of voluntarily reporting to the Committee all imports into the US of minerals from Rhodesia under the authority of the Byrd Amendment. Our quarterly reports to the Sanctions Committee contain information received from the US Customs Service based upon information supplied by the importer. The US Government must rely on the declaration of the importer that a particular shipment is of Rhodesian origin. We know of no reason why an importer would wish to declare a shipment to be of Rhodesian origin if that were not the case. And we know of no shipment of Rhodesian origin reported to the Sanctions Committee which was not in fact of Rhodesian origin."

7. A letter dated 10 September 1976 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 through 30 June 1976. Attached please find a list of these imports."

8. 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 28 September 1976, 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 3 above.

UNITED STATES IMPORTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

From 1 July to 30 September 1975

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity (in short tons)</u>	<u>Port of embarkation</u>	<u>Port of importation</u>	<u>Estimated date of arrival</u>	<u>Vessel</u>	<u>Country of registry</u>
Chrysotile asbestos fibers	362	Durban	Charleston, SC	7/1/75	Austral Pilot	US
High carbon ferro-chrome	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 fibers	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 ferro-chrome	11 024	Lourenço Marques	New Orleans, LA	8/11/75	Platte	Panama
Chrysotile asbestos fibers	212	Port Elizabeth	New York, NY/ Philadelphia, PA	8/18/75	Austral Pilot	US
High carbon ferro-chrome	250	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, LA	8/18/75	Great Faith	Panama
High carbon ferro-chrome	1 045	Lourenço Marques	Burnside, LA	8/18/75	Great Faith	Panama

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity (in short tons)</u>	<u>Port of embarkation</u>	<u>Port of importation</u>	<u>Estimated date of arrival</u>	<u>Vessel</u>	<u>Country of registry</u>
Chrome ore and concentrates	6 074*	Lourenço Marques	Charleston, SC	8/25/75	Great Faith	Panama
Asbestos fiber	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 fiber	73	Port Elizabeth	Charleston, SC	9/11/75	Austral Patriot	US
Asbestos fiber	103	Port Elizabeth	Norfolk, VA	9/19/75	African Meteor	US
High carbon ferro-chrome	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.

UNITED STATES IMPORTS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA:

From 1 October to 31 December 1975

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity (in short tons)</u>	<u>Port of embarkation</u>	<u>Port of importation</u>	<u>Estimated date of arrival</u>	<u>Vessel</u>	<u>Country of registry</u>
Chrysotile asbestos fiber	163	Durban	Charleston, SC	9/26/75*	African Meteor	US
Chrome ore	18 385	Beira	New Orleans, LA	10/7/75	Columbia	US
High carbon ferro-chrome	6 936	Durban	New Orleans, LA	10/7/75	Columbia	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	284	Durban	Baltimore, MD	10/13/75	Mormacpride	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	122	Durban	Baltimore, MD	10/21/75	Sealand Resource	US
Chrome ore	6 341	Beira	New Orleans, LA	10/30/75	Yellowstone	US
High carbon ferro-chrome	9 932	Maputo (Lourenço Marques)	New Orleans, LA	10/30/75	Yellowstone	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	276	Durban	Baltimore, MD	10/30/75	Mormacscan	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	364	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	10/30/75	Mormacscan	US
Chrome ore	4 984	Maputo (Lourenço Marques)	Charleston, SC	10/30/75	Kaderbaksh	Pakistan
High carbon ferro-chrome	8 208	Maputo (Lourenço Marques)	Baltimore, MD	11/3/75	Kaderbaksh	Pakistan
Asbestos fiber	90	Durban	Philadelphia, PA	11/4/75	Austral Pilot	US

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity (in short tons)</u>	<u>Port of embarkation</u>	<u>Port of importation</u>	<u>Estimated date of arrival</u>	<u>Vessel</u>	<u>Country of registry</u>
Beryl ore	43	Maputo (Lourenço Marques)	Philadelphia, PA	11/8/75	African Sun	US
Chrome ore	15 449	Maputo (Lourenço Marques)	Charleston, SC	11/16/75	Ocean Envoy	Pakistan
High carbon ferro-chrome	1 653	Durban	Cleveland, OH	11/16/75	African Sun	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	129	Durban	Baltimore, MD	11/20/75	Mormacglen	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	187	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	11/25/75	Mormacglen	US
Chrysotile asbestos fiber	67	Port Elizabeth	Boston, MA	12/4/75	Austral Pilot	US
Holfram ore	900	Durban	Philadelphia, PA	12/8/75	African Comet	US
Chrysotile asbestos fiber	150	Port Elizabeth	Houston, TX	12/11/75	Christopher Lykes	US
Chrysotile asbestos fiber	80	Port Elizabeth	Charleston, SC	12/29/75	Austral Pilot	US

12
22
81

* Information received too late to include in last quarter's report.

UNITED STATES IMPORTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

From 1 January to 30 June 1976

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity (in short tons)</u>	<u>Port of embarkation</u>	<u>Port of importation</u>	<u>Estimated date of arrival</u>	<u>Vessel</u>	<u>Country of registry</u>
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	220	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	1/11/76	Mormaccove	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	163	Durban	Baltimore, MD	1/11/76	Mormaccape	US
Asbestos fiber	55	Port Elizabeth	Philadelphia, PA	1/21/76	African Neptune	US
Ferro-chrome silicon	3 326	Maputo	Burnside, LA	1/25/76	Adabelle Lykes	US
Low carbon ferro-chrome	2 207	Durban	Burnside, LA	1/25/76	Adabelle Lykes	US
Low carbon ferro-chrome	553	Durban	Burnside, LA	1/25/76	Adabelle Lykes	US
Charge chrome	597	Maputo	Burnside, LA	1/27/76	Gulf Shipper	US
Charge chrome	2 215	Maputo	Burnside, LA	1/27/76	Gulf Shipper	US
Chrysotile asbestos fiber	138	Port Elizabeth	Charleston, SC	2/27/76	African Dawn	US
Asbestos fiber	74	Port Elizabeth	Philadelphia, PA	3/6/76	Austral Pilgrim	US
Chrome ore	9 849	Maputo	Charleston, SC	3/9/76	Phaedra-E	Greece

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity (in short tons)</u>	<u>Port of embarkation</u>	<u>Port of importation</u>	<u>Estimated date of arrival</u>	<u>Vessel</u>	<u>Country of registry</u>
Chrome ore	2 419	Maputo	Burnside, LA	3/9/76	Phaedra-E	Greece
Chrome ore	1 699	Maputo	Burnside, LA	3/9/76	Phaedra-E	Greece
Chrome ore	7 257	Maputo	Burnside, LA	3/9/76	Phaedra-E	Greece
Chrome ore	1 682	Maputo	Charleston, SC	3/19/76	Phaedra-E	Greece
Asbestos fiber	115	Port Elizabeth	Philadelphia, PA	4/2/76	Austral Patriot	US
Chrysotile asbestos	106	Port Elizabeth	New York, NY	4/10/76	Austral Patriot	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	110	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	4/18/76	Mormaclynx	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	71	Durban	Baltimore, MD	5/3/76	Mormacsan	US
Low carbon ferro-chrome	3 862	Maputo	Burnside, LA	6/12/76	Yellowstone	US
High carbon ferro-chrome	1 636	Durban	Burnside, LA	6/12/76	Yellowstone	US
Ferro-chrome silicon	7 152	Maputo	Burnside, LA	6/12/76	Yellowstone	US
Electrolytic nickel cathodes	101	Port Elizabeth	Baltimore, MD	6/22/76	Mormaclake	US

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

Case No. USI-1. Ferro-chrome silicon - "La Chacra": United States quarterly report dated 11 October 1972

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

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

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

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

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

Case No. USI-4. Nickel cathodes, asbestos fibre, ferro-silicon chromium and high-carbon ferro-chrome - "African Sun", "Moormacove", "Moormacargo", "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 eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 9 February 1976 was received from Greece, transmitting an official translation in English of decree No. 503 relating to the case of the vessel Hellenic Leader which had been issued by the Council of the Magistrates of the Court of First Instance of Piraeus on 29 June 1974. A summary of that decree appears in volume I, chapter I, paragraph 66 of the present report.

Case No. USI-6. High-carbon ferro-chrome - "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 eighth 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 ninth, tenth and eleventh quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April, 13 August and 15 December 1976, respectively.
4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of South Africa announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which a reply was still pending after two reminders.
5. At the time of the preparation of the present report, the proposed meeting had not yet taken place.
6. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included South Africa in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

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

Case No. USI-8. Nickel cathodes - "Marne Lloyd", "Musi Lloyd" and "Merwe Lloyd":
United States quarterly reports dated 10 July and 11 October 1972

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

Case No. USI-9. Low-carbon ferro-chrome, ferro-chrome 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 eighth 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 ninth, tenth and eleventh quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April, 13 August and 15 December 1976, respectively.

Case No. USI-10. Ferro-chrome - "Trade Carrier": United States quarterly report dated 9 April 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth, tenth and eleventh quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April, 13 August and 15 December 1976, respectively.

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

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

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

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

Case No. USI-13. High-carbon ferro-chrome, 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 eighth 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 ninth, tenth and eleventh quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April, 13 August and 15 December 1976, respectively.

Case No. USI-14. Low-carbon ferro-chrome and high-carbon ferro-chrome - "Costas Frangos" and "Nortrans Unity", respectively: United States quarterly report dated 2 July 1973

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

Case No. USI-15. High-carbon ferro-chrome - "Weltevreden": United States quarterly report dated 2 July 1973

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.

4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of South Africa announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which a reply was still pending after three reminders.

5. At the time of the preparation of the present report, the proposed meeting had not yet taken place.

6. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included South Africa in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

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

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

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

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 eighth 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 ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.

4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of South Africa announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which a reply was still pending after three reminders.

5. At the time of the preparation of the present report, the proposed meeting had not yet taken place.

6. Further to paragraph 3 above, the Committee again included South Africa in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

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

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

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

Case No. USI-24. High-carbon ferro-chrome - "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

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

Case No. USI-26. Nickel cathodes - "Western Express": United States quarterly report dated 9 May 1974

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

Case No. USI-27. Ferro-chrome silicon - "Stockenfels": United States quarterly report dated 9 May 1974

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

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. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of South Africa announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which a reply was still pending after three reminders.

4. At the time of the preparation of the present report, the proposed meeting had not yet taken place.

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

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

Case No. USI-30. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kimberley": United States quarterly report dated 6 September 1974

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

Case No. USI-31. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kembla": United States quarterly report dated 6 September 1974

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

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

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

Case No. USI-33. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Nedlloyd Kyoto": United States quarterly report dated 14 November 1974

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

Case No. USI-34. Electrolytic nickel cathodes - "Diana Skou": United States quarterly report dated 14 November 1974

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

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

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

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

3. A further note dated 8 January 1976 was received from Greece stating that the competent Greek authorities were still actively pursuing the investigation of the case and the results of the inquiry would be communicated to the Committee as soon as they were available.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.
4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Liberia announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.
5. On 30 August 1976 the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Panama and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meeting, see the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.

6. Further to paragraph 3, above, the Committee again included Liberia in the eleventh quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 15 December 1976.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee again included that Government in the ninth and tenth quarterly lists, which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976.
4. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Panama announcing the Chairman's intention of contacting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case, among others, in connexion with which replies were still pending after three reminders.
5. On 16 August 1976 the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Panama and discussed the case in question. For an account of the meeting, see the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.
6. Subsequently, a comprehensive reply dated 9 December 1976, addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, was received from Panama, covering the cases involving Panama in general but also containing particular reference to Case Nos. USI-41 and USI-42. The substantive part of that reply reads as follows:

"I am writing to inform you of the efforts being made by the Government of the Republic of Panama to ensure the effective implementation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, of the difficulties which have been encountered in the past and of the measures currently being taken to ensure implementation of the resolution.

"We wish to emphasize, first of all, that Panama has always supported the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination, as is attested by innumerable records and resolutions of various United Nations committees and other bodies. Forming as it did an important part of this lengthy struggle, Security Council resolution 253 (1968) won our immediate support, and Council resolutions 217 (1965) and 232 (1966) also received our support, as can be seen from Cabinet Decrees No. 276 of 21 August 1969, No. 23 of 21 March 1967 and No. 186 of 13 April 1966. These Decrees incorporated into Panamanian legislation the measures taken by the Security Council and prescribed specific penalties for violators.

"In spite of this, we find that the Committee over which you preside has in its files a number of cases relating to alleged violations of the above-mentioned resolutions which mainly concern vessels of Panamanian registration which carried ore of possible Southern Rhodesian origin.

"Our Government has had difficulty in clearly defining the responsibility in each case, and we find that in some of these cases, such as the ones involving the vessels Platte and Ogden Missouri, the vessels in question are no longer under Panamanian registration.

"Our Government nevertheless reaffirms its support for the work of the Committee and its firm determination to prevent violations of the provisions enacted for this purpose. We are pleased to transmit to you herewith a copy of circular No. 18/76 of 9 June 1976, issued by the Director of the Department of Consular Affairs and Shipping of the Panamanian Ministry of Finance, which gives instructions to all Panamanian consuls in this regard."

Text of the circular dated 9 June 1976 issued by the Director of the Department of Consular Affairs and Shipping of the Panamanian Ministry of Finance, addressed to Panamanian consular officials abroad and transmitting to them the texts of the three decrees

"In view of the fact that the Panamanian Government has been receiving constant allegations to the effect that Panamanian-flag vessels are violating the prohibitions contained in the above-mentioned Decrees, this Department is hereby transmitting to you a copy of each of the Decrees so that you may inform shipowners of their contents.

"As you will note, article 3 of Decree No. 186 (1966) and article 2 of Decree No. 23 (1967) provide that vessels which fail to comply with the Decrees are to be penalized by cancellation of their Panamanian registration; it is therefore essential that every consular official should make this known through the communications media as soon as possible and should also publicize the contents of Decree No. 276 (1969).

I have received circular No. 18/76 of 9 June 1976 from the Department of Consular Affairs and Shipping of the Ministry of Finance.

Signature and seal

Place and date

"Subject: Transmittal of Decrees No. 186 of 13 April 1966, No. 23 of 21 March 1967 and No. 276 of 21 August 1969 concerning restrictions imposed by the United Nations Security Council.

Text of Decree No. 186 of 13 April 1966

prohibiting vessels of Panamanian registration from transporting oil or petroleum derivatives to Southern Rhodesia

THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC,

by virtue of the authority vested in him,

CONSIDERING

"That the Republic of Panama is a Member of the United Nations;

"That the United Nations General Assembly, in resolutions 2022 (XX) and 2024 (XX) of 8 and 12 November 1965, drew the attention of the Security Council to the explosive situation in Southern Rhodesia as a threat to international peace and security and recommended the Council to consider that situation as a matter of urgency;

"That the United Nations Security Council, in resolution 216 (1965) of 12 November 1965, decided to condemn the unilateral declaration of independence made by a racist minority in Southern Rhodesia and further decided to call upon all States not to recognize that illegal racist minority régime and to refrain from rendering any assistance to that illegal régime;

"That the Security Council, in resolution 217 (1965) of 20 November 1965, called upon all States to refrain from any action which would assist and encourage the illegal régime and, in particular, to desist from providing it with arms, equipment and military material, and to do their utmost in order to break all economic relations with Southern Rhodesia, including an embargo on oil and petroleum products;

"That there is no justification for transporting oil and petroleum derivatives bound for Southern Rhodesia in Panamanian-flag vessels and that such transport could give rise to violations of the United Nations decisions and would, if permitted, constitute a form of aid and assistance to the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia;

"That under article 1 of Act No. 54 (1926) the Government of Panama is required to prevent vessels under its registration from engaging in illicit trade in violation of the international obligations of the Republic;

"That it is the constitutional duty of the President of the Republic to direct foreign relations, a duty which must be deemed to apply to the consideration and disposition of all matters affecting the relations of the Republic with other countries and with international organizations, including matters relating to the implementation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations;

"DECREES AS FOLLOWS:

"Article 1. Vessels of the national merchant marine are prohibited from transporting oil and petroleum derivatives to Southern Rhodesia.

"Article 2. Any Panamanian vessel which arrives in a foreign port carrying oil or petroleum derivatives bound for Southern Rhodesia shall be required by the Panamanian consul in the said port, or by the person acting in his stead, to take the necessary measures to ensure that the cargo does not reach its destination, and the vessel shall not be permitted to sail until it complies with these instructions.

"If the vessel should sail without authorization from the consular official concerned, its registration shall be cancelled forthwith pursuant to article 3.

"Article 3. Panamanian vessels which violate the prohibitions contained in this decree shall lose their status as Panamanian-flag vessels and their registration shall be cancelled forthwith.

"Article 4. Re-registration shall not be granted to any vessel whose registration has been cancelled by reason of violation of the provisions of this Decree.

"Furthermore, registration shall not be granted to any vessel whose registration has been cancelled by any State Member of the United Nations for the same reasons as those specified in this Decree.

"Article 5. Panamanian consular officials shall be responsible for giving immediate effect to the provisions of the preceding articles and for notifying the captain of any offending vessel that its registration has been cancelled. They shall also inform the Ministry of Finance forthwith by cable of any case which occurs and shall similarly inform the authorities of the place where they are exercising their functions.

"Article 6. Where a vessel falling under the provisions of the preceding article arrives in a port in which there is no Panamanian consul, the consul nearest to the place of its arrival shall request the consul of a friendly country resident in the port in which the vessel has arrived to take the same measures and to inform him of the results thereof so that appropriate measures and penalties may be applied pursuant to this Decree.

"Article 7. This Decree shall enter into force upon being issued.

"IT IS HEREBY DIRECTED THAT THIS DECREE BE DULY PROMULGATED.

"Done at Panama City on 13 April 1966."

Text of Decree No. 23 of 21 March 1967

"supplementing Executive Decree No. 186 of 13 April 1966 and adopting the new restrictions on trade with Southern Rhodesia imposed by the United Nations Security Council in resolution 232 (1966)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC,

by virtue of the authority vested in him,

CONSIDERING

"That, under Executive Decree No. 186 of 13 April 1966, vessels of Panamanian registration were prohibited from transporting oil and petroleum derivatives to Southern Rhodesia;

"That the United Nations Security Council, in resolution 232 (1966), imposed new restrictions on trade with Southern Rhodesia by States Members of the United Nations;

"That it is the duty of States Members of the United Nations to give effect to the restrictions so imposed;

"DECREES AS FOLLOWS:

"Article 1. Vessels of Panamanian registration are prohibited from transporting asbestos, iron ore, chrome, pig-iron, sugar, tobacco, copper, meat and meat products and hides, skins and leather originating in Southern Rhodesia and exported therefrom.

"Article 2. Vessels of Panamanian registration which violate the provisions of this Decree shall be liable to the penalties prescribed in articles 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of Executive Decree No. 186 of 13 April 1966.

"Article 3. This Decree shall enter into force as from the date on which it is issued.

"IT IS HEREBY DIRECTED THAT THIS DECREE BE DULY PROMULGATED.

"Done at Panama City on 21 March 1967."

Text of Decree No. 276 of 21 August 1969

"adopting additional restrictions on trade with Southern Rhodesia

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNING JUNTA,

CONSIDERING

"That the United Nations Security Council, in resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, imposed new restrictions on trade with Southern Rhodesia;

"That the Republic of Panama is a Member of the United Nations and, as such, is duty-bound to comply with the decisions of that international Organization,

"DECREES AS FOLLOWS:

"Article 1. The following additional restrictions on trade with Southern Rhodesia, approved by the United Nations Security Council in resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, are hereby adopted:

"The following are prohibited:

"(a) The import of all commodities and products originating in Southern Rhodesia and exported therefrom (whether or not the commodities or products are for consumption or processing in Panamanian territory, whether or not they are imported in bond and whether or not any special legal status with respect to the import of goods is enjoyed by the port or other place where they are imported or stored;

"(b) Any activities which are calculated to promote the export of any commodities or products from Southern Rhodesia and any dealings in any commodities or products originating in Southern Rhodesia and exported therefrom, including in particular any transfer of funds to Southern Rhodesia for the purposes of such activities or dealings;

"(c) The shipment in Panamanian vessels or aircraft or in vessels or aircraft under charter to Panamanian persons or bodies, and the carriage (whether or not in bond) by land transport facilities across our territory, of any commodities or products originating in Southern Rhodesia and exported therefrom;

"(d) The sale or supply of any commodities or products (whether or not originating in our territory, but not including supplies intended strictly for medical purposes, educational equipment and material for use in schools and other educational institutions, publications, news material and, in special humanitarian circumstances, food-stuffs) to any person or body for the purpose of any business carried on in or operated from Southern Rhodesia, and any activities which promote or are calculated to promote such sale or supply;

"(e) The shipment in Panamanian vessels or aircraft or in vessels or aircraft under charter to Panamanian persons or bodies, or the carriage (whether or not in bond) by land transport facilities, of any such commodities or products which are consigned to any person or body in Southern Rhodesia or to any other person or body for the purposes of any business carried on in or operated from Southern Rhodesia.

"Article 2. It shall be forbidden to make available to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or to any commercial, industrial or public utility undertaking in Southern Rhodesia any funds for investment or any other financial or economic resources and to make such funds available

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, food-stuffs;

"Article 3. The entry, 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, shall be prohibited, as shall the entry of persons whom there is reason to believe to have furthered or encouraged, or to be likely to further or encourage, unlawful actions calculated to evade any measure decided upon in this resolution or resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966;

"Article 4. Panamanian airline companies and aircraft of our registration or under charter to our nationals are prohibited from operating to or from Southern Rhodesia and from linking up with any airline company constituted or aircraft registered in Southern Rhodesia.

"Article 5. This Cabinet Decree shall enter into force upon publication in the Official Gazette.

"It is hereby directed that this Decree be duly promulgated.

"Done at Panama City on 21 August 1969."

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. For additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report, see paragraphs 4-6 of Case No. USI-37 above.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A note dated 15 March 1976 was sent to Pakistan under the no-objection procedure, expressing the Committee's appreciation for the thorough and prompt investigations undertaken by the Government in this matter and indicating that the Committee had taken due note of the findings of the investigating authorities and had particularly noted the measures undertaken by the Government to ensure that Pakistani ship owners did not in the future repeat incidences of the nature that had given rise to the present case.

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A note dated 18 December 1975 was sent to the Netherlands under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee has examined carefully His Excellency's reply of 21 November 1975 concerning the case mentioned above and noted the Government's finding that the reported shipment of electrolytic nickel cathodes in question had actually originated in South Africa.

"The Committee has expressed its concern at the growing number of cases of this kind in which conflicting reports are given by the United States and the replying Governments with regard to the origin of the shipments under investigation. It has therefore expressed the hope that His Excellency's Government might inform it of the exact types of the South African documents examined in the present case and, if possible, submit to it copies of those documents. In this connexion the Committee wishes the attention of the Government to be drawn to the Committee's position regarding documentary proof of origin emanating from South Africa, as indicated in paragraph 20 of the Committee's seventh report (S/11594), which reads in part as follows:

'The Committee again drew the attention of the Governments concerned to the fact that, in the prevailing circumstances, bills of lading and Chamber of Commerce certificates emanating from South Africa or Portuguese-controlled Territories should not be regarded as sufficient proof of origin. The Committee noted with regret that certain Governments continued to allow the importation of cargoes solely on the basis of such suspect documentation. It recommended that the investigating authorities should seek the documentation suggested in the memorandum on the application of sanctions of 2 September 1969, which had been transmitted to all Governments on 18 September 1969 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VI).'

"In accordance with the Committee's request, the Secretary-General would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

4. A reply dated 4 February 1976 was received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As stated in the Permanent Representative's note of 21 November 1975, No. 7437, the bills of lading indicated that the cargo in question came from the Republic of South Africa. The Netherlands Government, therefore, had no reason to assume that the shipping agents had deliberately violated paragraph 3 (c) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"With respect to the fourth paragraph of the note of the Secretary-General, in which a part of paragraph 20 of the seventh report of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) is quoted, e/ it should be pointed out that in this case the question of the import of goods into the Netherlands does not arise. As stated in the Permanent Representative's note No. 7437, the cargo concerned was destined for the United States of America, for which reason the Netherlands authorities could only investigate those documents falling within the responsibility of the shipping firm, i.e. the bills of lading.

"The Netherlands Government regrets that it cannot comply with the request of the Committee to submit to it copies of the documents with regard to the transport of the aforementioned cargo by the MS. Nedlloyd Kingston. These documents contain company data which are the property of the Netherlands shipping company Nederlandse Scheepvaart Unie. Under Netherlands legislation Dutch companies cannot be compelled to make public such data."

Case No. USI-41. Chrome ore - "Ogden Missouri": United States quarterly report dated 14 November 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 14 November 1975 (see eighth report, S/11927, para. 54 (c)), 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 July to 30 September 1975.
2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 12 January 1976 was sent to Panama requesting that the matter be investigated.
3. A first reminder was sent to Panama on 17 March 1976.
4. A second reminder was sent to Panama on 19 April 1976.
5. An acknowledgement dated 27 April 1976 (also covering Case Nos. USI-42 and USI-43) was received from Panama, stating that the General Consular and Ships Department of the Ministry of the Treasury and Finance of Panama had begun taking appropriate measures to obtain clarification of the situation in question with regard to, inter alia, the vessel involved in the present case.
6. A further reminder was sent to Panama on 26 May 1976, inquiring whether the investigation had been completed and the result could be communicated to the Committee.
7. A third reminder was sent to Panama on 7 July 1976.

e/ Refers to part of the standard third reminder, the text of which was adopted by the Committee, as indicated in the eighth report (chap. I, para. 14).

8. In the absence of a reply from Panama, the Committee included that Government in the tenth quarterly list, which was issued as a press release on 13 August 1976.

9. A reply dated 17 August 1976, enclosing copies of various communications pertaining to Case Nos. USI-41, USI-42 and USI-43, as well as to Case No. 195, was received from Panama. The substantive part of the reply and the texts of the enclosures are reproduced below.

Letter dated 17 August 1976 from Panama

"The Delegation of Panama ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note concerning Case Nos. USI-41, USI-42 and USI-43.

"In the first place, it is stated in the aforementioned communication that Panama did not reply to the requests addressed to it in March and April 1976.

"The fact is that the delegation of Panama to the United Nations did reply in good time; note 143 of 27 April 1976 is proof of this. It was stated at that time that 'the General Office of Consular Affairs and Shipping of the Ministry of the Treasury and Finance of Panama has begun taking appropriate measures to obtain clarification of the situation in question by the owners of the ships Ogden Missouri, Platte and Great Faith. Should they fail to do so, the relevant penalties will be imposed'.

"As a result of these measures, replies and explanations have been obtained which the Government of Panama is transmitting to the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), the documents in question being as follows:

'1. Letter dated 28 January 1976 from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations addressed to the Government of Panama, in which he transmits to the Panamanian Government the complaint relating to cases USI-41, USI-42 and USI-43.

'2. Letter dated 18 March 1976 from the Consul-General of Panama at New Orleans, United States of America, addressed to Miss Camila M. Vives, Director of the Department of Consular Affairs and Shipping of the Ministry of the Treasury and Finance of the Republic of Panama.'

"As can be seen, the company which owns the vessel provides explanations at the request of the Panamanian Government. These communications demonstrate that the charges made in the aforementioned note of the Secretary-General are unfounded.

"In response to further requests by the Panamanian Government, the Burnside Marine Services Company replied by its note dated 20 April 1976 (enclosed).

'3. Letter from the Burnside Marine Services Company, owner of the vessel Great Faith, in which they inform the Consulate of Panama

at New Orleans that the ore which they transported in August 1975 was taken on at the port of Lourenço Marques in Mozambique. The letter is dated 17 March 1976.

'4. Letter signed by the Superintendent of Docks of New Orleans, United States of America, attesting to the action taken by the Panamanian Government to comply with the obligations arising from Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

'5. Letter from the Panamanian Law firm, Arias, Fábrega y Fábrega, in their capacity as legal representatives of the Burnside Marine Services Company, addressed to the Director of the Shipping Section of the Ministry of the Treasury and Finance of the Republic of Panama. This letter includes as an annex a communication dated 16 March 1976 from the President of the Burnside Marine Services Company addressed to their Panamanian lawyers.

'6. Letter dated 28 May 1976 from the Office of Shipping of the Ministry of Finance of Panama addressed to the Consul-General of Panama in New York. In this letter, as can be seen, the Consulate of Panama in New York is asked to confirm as soon as possible the version given by the Burnside Marine Services Company that the Consulate of Panama in New York told them that there were no restrictions on the transport of ore from Rhodesia.

'7. Note No. 418-DHET from the Minister of the Treasury and Finance of the Republic of Panama addressed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Panama. In this note, dated 30 May 1976, the Panamanian Minister of Finance refers to the following cases:

1. USI-41 (Ogden Missouri)
2. USI-42 (Platte)
3. USI-43 (Great Faith)'

"As can be seen from the penultimate paragraph of the note, the senior official who sent it states that he is continuing the investigation to determine 'whether any penalties should be imposed in spite of the evidence submitted'.

'8. Note No. DOI-2556 dated 20 May 1976 from the Director of the Department of International Organizations, Conferences and Treaties of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs addressed to the Director of the Department of Consular Affairs and Shipping of the Ministry of the Treasury and Finance of Panama. This note refers to the case "of the Panamanian undertaking, Elco Shipping Co., SA", owner of the Greek vessel Soula K, relating to violation of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by Security Council resolution 253 (1968).'f/

f/ See para. 6 (a) of (163) Case No. 195 in annex II above.

"The delegation of Panama to the United Nations considers that the foregoing documentation is sufficient proof of its Government's interest in complying with the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by the Security Council in 1968.

"This delegation wishes to place on record its displeasure at the admonitory content of Note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1).

"In conclusion, the delegation of Panama to the United Nations wishes it to be noted that:

(A) The Government of Panama, in compliance with the clear mandate of the United Nations and the provisions of its own legislation presently in force, will continue to co-operate with the Committee on Sanctions against Southern Rhodesia established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council of the United Nations.

(B) It is continuing the investigation into the matter of requiring the Burnside Marine Services Company to face its responsibilities.

(C) There is no evidence whatever at the Consulate of Panama in New York that the said Company was told that there are no restrictions on the transport of ore originating in Southern Rhodesia.

(D) It considers that there are cases concerning vessels and shipping undertakings which have taken up the time of the Committee for a number of years without any discernible likelihood of appropriate measures being applied. On occasion, the same vessels have changed names or owners, and the undertakings operating them have disappeared. This points to the need for dropping such cases and concentrating on the more recent ones where the trail is still warm. This would produce more tangible results."

Letter dated 28 January 1976 from the Permanent Representative
of Panama to the United Nations addressed to the Minister for
Foreign Affairs of Panama

"The Secretary-General of the United Nations has informed us of further violations involving Panamanian merchant vessels of the sanctions established in paragraph 3 (c) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) which prohibits the transport of cargo originating in Southern Rhodesia. The specific violations are as follows:

'(1) A cargo of 16,325 tons of chrome ore of Southern Rhodesian origin was discharged in the port of Charleston, South Carolina (USA) on 2 August 1975 by the vessel Ogden Missouri.

'(2) A cargo of 11,024 tons of high-carbon ferro-chrome of Southern Rhodesian origin was discharged in the port of New Orleans, Louisiana (USA) on 11 August 1975 by the vessel Platte.

'(3) A cargo of 1,295 tons of high-carbon ferro-chrome of Southern Rhodesian origin was discharged in the port of Burnside, Louisiana (USA) on 18 August 1975 by the vessel Great Faith, and a cargo of 6,074 tons of chrome

ore and extracts of Southern Rhodesian origin was discharged in the port of Charleston, South Carolina, on 25 August 1975 by the same vessel.'

"We ask that you request the Ministry of the Treasury and Finance to investigate these facts and apply the appropriate sanctions to the vessels in question, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council."

Letter dated 18 March 1976 from the Consul-General of Panama, New Orleans, USA, addressed to the Director General, Office of Consular Affairs and Shipping, Ministry of the Treasury and Finance, Panama

"With reference to your note No. 601-56 CN regarding the ships Platte and Great Faith, in which you requested that I conduct an investigation to determine whether those ships had carried goods originating in Southern Rhodesia to this port, we should like to inform you of the following:

"1. The New Orleans Port Authorities report that the ships Platte and Great Faith have not put in at the port of New Orleans during the past three years.

"2. The Burnside Marine Services Co. of the port of Burnside, Louisiana, reports that the ship Great Faith put in at the port of Burnside on 30 August and discharged 5,515,050 metric tons of chrome ore.

"3. The originals of the letters from the New Orleans Port Authorities and the letter from Burnside Marine Services are enclosed.

"We remain at your disposal should you require additional information."

Letter dated 25 March 1976 from the attorneys of the owners of the vessels "Ogden Missouri" and "Platte" addressed to the Director-General, Office of Consular Affairs and Shipping, Ministry of the Treasury and Finance, Panama

"We refer to your note No. 601-58-CN of 19 February 1976 regarding a complaint by the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning certain violations alleged to have been committed by the ships Ogden Missouri and Platte.

"In this connexion, we are sending you herewith photo-copies of letters received from the President of Ogden Platte Transport, Inc. and Ogden Missouri Transport, Inc., owners of the two aforementioned ships.

"It is apparent from the content of these letters that the owners of the ships in question acted in good faith in transporting this cargo, since they were informed by the Consul of Panama in New York in 1974 that there were no restrictions on the transport of ore originating in Mozambique.

"We remain at your disposal to assist with any similar matter."

Letter dated 20 May 1976 from the Director of the Department of International Organizations, Conferences and Treaties addressed to the Director of Consular Affairs and Shipping, Ministry of the Treasury and Finance, Panama

"I have the honour to refer to note No. 849 DMHT dated 30 July 1975 from His Excellency Miguel A. Sánchez, Minister of the Treasury and Finance, regarding the case of the Panamanian firm Elco Shipping Co., SA, owner of the Greek vessel Soula K, concerning violation of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"In connexion with this note, I should be very grateful if you would inform this Ministry regarding the last paragraph of the note concerning the clarification which the Panamanian company representing this firm in our country is to provide."

Letter dated 28 May 1976 from the Director-General, Office of Consular Affairs and Shipping, Ministry of the Treasury and Finance, addressed to the Consul-General of Panama, New York

"In the light of the complaint against the Panamanian ships Ogden Missouri and Platte, received by this General Office through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations, in which it is stated that the ships in question discharged goods originating in Southern Rhodesia in United States ports, we communicated with their legal representatives. The jurisdiction given by the owners is that the Consul-General of Panama in New York informed them in the summer of 1974 that Panamanian vessels were not subject to any restrictions on goods originating in Southern Rhodesia. Accordingly we should like to request that you confirm this information as soon as possible.

"For your information, we are enclosing photo-copies of the notes referred to in the preceding paragraph."

Letter dated 30 May 1976 from the Minister of the Treasury and Finance, addressed to the Permanent Representative of Panama to the United Nations

"With regard to our communication No. 249-DMHT of 18 February 1976, I am enclosing herewith photo-copies of the documents received in connexion with the complaint made against the ships Ogden Missouri, Platte and Great Faith, all of Panamanian registry, concerning violations committed by these ships by reason of transporting cargo from Southern Rhodesia.

"On the basis of the documentation submitted, it has been established that:

'(1) Ogden Missouri: The ship's owners report that the vessel left the port of Lourenço Marques in Mozambique and that before its departure they requested information from our Consulate-General in New York confirming the

statement made in 1974 that there were no restrictions. We are presently communicating with that consular office to determine whether this information is accurate. (Annexes I and I-1.)

'(2) Great Faith: From information obtained by our Consulate-General at New Orleans, the vessel Great Faith arrived at the port of Burnside on 30 August 1975 also proceeding from the port of Lourenço Marques, Mozambique. Accordingly, the vessel's legal representatives claim that the goods were not of Southern Rhodesian origin. (Annexes II, II-1, II-2, III.)

'(3) Platte: This vessel is in the same situation as the vessel Ogden Missouri; consequently, confirmation has been requested from our Consul-General in New York. (Annexes IV and V.)'

"Nevertheless, we have referred this matter to the Legal Department of the General Office of Consular Affairs and Shipping so that it can determine whether any penalties should be imposed in spite of the evidence submitted."

10. At the 278th meeting on 4 November 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement concerning the case in which he informed the Committee that the vessel Ogden Missouri, registered in Panama, had taken on 16,325 tons of chrome ore at Lourenço Marques and had unloaded at Charleston, South Carolina, on 4 August 1974 and that the arrival date had been confirmed by the United States Government.

11. A further reply dated 5 November 1976 was received from Panama, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Panama to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and wishes to inform him that the Government of Panama, after a detailed investigation, has reached the conclusion that the vessel Ogden Missouri (Case No. USI-41), accused of an alleged violation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), is not guilty of such a violation.

"As proof of the above assertion we attach herewith:

"(1) Memorandum sent to the Consular and Naval Directorate of the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Panama by Mr. Bernardo Escartín, Legal Adviser of that office;

"(2) 'Bill of lading' relating to the cargo of chrome ore which that vessel took on in the port of Lourenço Marques on 2 August 1975;

"(3) Copy of the letter DOI-5322 from Mr. Aquilino Boyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama.

"The Permanent Mission of Panama hopes that this will provide yet another example of its readiness to co-operate with the Sanctions Committee established under Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

12. The documents, analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant, did not indicate the country of origin of the cargo of chrome ore weighing 14,808,950 kilogrammes (16,324 short tons) shipped from Lourenço Marques (Maputo)

to Charleston, South Carolina aboard the ship Ogden Missouri, a vessel given as being of Panamanian registry. The weight given by Panama was equivalent to that submitted by the United States Government. It was pointed out to the Committee that the documents submitted by Panama could not be considered as sufficient proof of origin of the suspected shipment in accordance with the memorandum on the application of sanctions transmitted to all States on 18 September 1969.

13. At the 282nd meeting on 9 December 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement concerning this case in which he informed the Committee that the State Department of his Government had been in contact with the Panamanian Embassy regarding the case.

14. A comprehensive reply dated 9 December 1976, covering the cases involving Panama in general, but also containing particular reference to Case Nos. USI-41 and USI-42, was received from Panama. For the substantive part of that reply see Case No. USI-37, paragraph 6, above.

Case No. USI-42. High carbon ferro-chrome - "Platte": United States quarterly report dated 14 November 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 14 November 1975 (see eighth report, S/11927, para. 54 (c)), 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 July to 30 September 1975.

2. For additional information concerning this case, see paragraphs 2 to 9 of Case No. USI-41 above.

3. At the 278th meeting on 4 November 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement concerning the case in which he informed the Committee that the vessel Platte, registered in Panama, had come from Lourenço Marques, and was alleged to have unloaded 11,024 tons of ferro-chrome with a high carbon content at New Orleans, Louisiana, on 11 August 1975. The United States Government was pursuing its inquiry with a view to confirming the arrival date of the vessel and would inform the Committee of its findings.

4. At the 282nd meeting on 9 December 1976 the representative of the United States made a further statement concerning the case, the text of which is reproduced below:

"The Department of State has reviewed US Government records pertaining to Case USI-42. The importers initially provided information to the US Customs, the US Department of Commerce, and the US Department of State, indicating that the Platte planned to discharge its cargo of 11,024 tons of high carbon tetrochrome at New Orleans, Louisiana, on 11 August 1975. Subsequent investigation has confirmed, however, that a cargo of 10,000.7 metric tons was actually imported through Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on 17 August 1975."

5. A comprehensive reply dated 9 December 1976, covering the cases involving Panama in general, but also containing particular reference to Case Nos. USI-41

and USI-42, was received from Panama. For the substantive part of that reply, see Case No. USI-37, paragraph 6 above.

Case No. USI-43. High carbon ferro-chrome, chrome and concentrates - "Great Faith": United States quarterly report dated 14 November 1975

1. In its quarterly report dated 14 November 1975 (see eighth report, S/11927, para. 54 (c)), 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 July to 30 September 1975.
2. For additional information concerning this case, see paragraphs 2 to 9 of Case No. USI-41 above.
3. At the 278th meeting on 4 November 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement concerning the present case in which he informed the Committee that the vessel Great Faith, registered in Panama, had come from Lourenço Marques and on 30 August 1975 had arrived at Burnside, Louisiana, where it had unloaded 1,295 tons of ferro-chrome with a high carbon content and that it had also been carrying 6,074 tons of chrome ore and chrome concentrates, which had been unloaded at Charleston, South Carolina, on 5 September 1975. The date of arrival of the vessel had been confirmed by the United States Government.
4. For additional information concerning this case, see paragraph 6 of Case No. USI-37 above.

Case No. USI-44. High carbon ferro-chrome - "Kaderbaksh": United States quarterly report covering the period 1 October to 31 December 1975

1. In its periodic report submitted at the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976 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 October to 31 December 1975.
2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 28 August 1976 was sent to Pakistan requesting that the matter be investigated.
3. At the 280th meeting on 18 November 1976 the representative of Pakistan made a statement to the Committee concerning this case, as well as Case No. USI-45. The text of that statement is reproduced below.

"... I wish to raise under agenda item No. 4, other matters, two cases Nos. USI-44 and USI-45, respectively, whereby the Secretary-General had requested the Government of Pakistan to investigate the circumstances in which cargo of Southern Rhodesian origin was allegedly carried by two Pakistani ships, the Ocean Envoy and Kaderbaksh. The Ocean Envoy was alleged to have carried 15,449 tons of chrome ore of Southern Rhodesian origin to the Port of Charleston, South Carolina, USA, on 16 October 1975 while the Kaderbaksh had allegedly discharged a cargo of 4,984 tons of chrome

ore and another cargo of 8,208 tons of high carbon ferro-chrome of Southern Rhodesian origin to the port of Charleston, South Carolina, USA, on 30 October and 3 November 1975 respectively. Immediately on receipt of these complaints the Government of Pakistan started investigations into the alleged violation of sanctions.

"Before conveying the results of the actual investigation, I wish to place on record that the import and export policy of my Government has been framed bearing in mind the provisions of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council and other relevant United Nations resolutions. For instance, the import policy order 1975, paragraph 7 (I), reads as follows:

'Sources of import. (I) 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 of goods originating from any of these countries.'

"Keeping in view Pakistan's import policy which categorically prohibits trade, inter alia, with Rhodesia, preliminary inquiries reveal that the Pakistani vessels Kaderbaksh and Ocean Envoy loaded their cargo in bulk from Lourenço Marques (Maputo), Mozambique, on 19 September and 25 September 1975 respectively, and, as such, the masters of the ship were not aware of its origin.

"Notwithstanding the above, the Government of Pakistan has taken a serious view of these incidents and the concerned shipping companies have been directed to adopt a policy of excluding way ports, even if by doing so Pakistan would incur substantial losses on the outward passage, in order to avoid the likelihood of any such incidents recurring in future. At the same time investigations have been instituted to establish why due care was not exercised to ascertain the origin of the cargo by the masters of the ships. I wish to assure the Committee that suitable action would be taken against the person or persons found responsible for the negligence resulting in a breach of the import policy of Pakistan. Information regarding such action will be conveyed to the Secretary-General in due course."

4. A note dated 14 December 1976 was sent to Pakistan, under the no-objection procedure, the substantive part of which is reproduced below.

"The Committee, after considering the reply from His Excellency's Government given by the representative of Pakistan in his statement at the 280th meeting concerning consignments of Southern Rhodesian origin to the United States of America, by the vessels Kaderbaksh and Ocean Envoy, decided to request the Secretary-General to express its appreciation to the Government of Pakistan for its co-operation and for the investigations already set in train.

"The Committee noted the intention of the Permanent Mission of Pakistan to communicate to it in due course the results of the investigations referred to in the statement. The Committee requested the Secretary-General to indicate that it would appreciate receiving the results of those investigations at the earliest possible date. It 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."

Case No. USI-45. Chrome ore - "Ocean Envoy": United States quarterly report covering the period 1 October to 31 December 1975

1. In its periodic report submitted at the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976 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 October to 31 December 1975.
2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 28 August 1976, was sent to Pakistan requesting that the matter be investigated.
3. At the 280th meeting on 18 November 1976, the representative of Pakistan made a statement concerning this case, as well as Case No. USI-44. For the text of that statement, see Case No. USI-44, paragraph 3, above.
4. A note dated 14 December 1976 was sent to Pakistan under the no-objection procedure, for the text of which see paragraph 4 in Case No. USI-44 above.

Case No. USI-46. Chrome ore - "Phaedra E": United States quarterly report dated 10 September 1976

1. In its quarterly report dated 10 September 1976, 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 January to 30 June 1976.
2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 30 September 1976 was sent to Greece requesting that the matter be investigated.

Annex IV

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

GRAPHITE

- (75) Case No. 38. "Kaaoland": United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
- (76) Case No. 43. "Tanga": United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
- (77) Case No. 62. "Transvaal", "Kaaoland", "Stellenbosh" 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

- (118) 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.

- (119) 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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fifth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 276th meeting on 22 July 1976, the representative of Sweden assured the Committee that had there been any doubt as to what use would be made of the medical equipment exported to Southern Rhodesia her Government would not have granted the export licence for the equipment.
4. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the representative of Sweden reaffirmed that the export of medical equipment for the University of Southern Rhodesia had been made in full compliance with the provisions of paragraph 3 (d) of Security

Council resolution 253 (1968). The Committee accepted assurances given by the representative of Sweden and the matter was thereafter considered closed.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 267th meeting on 28 April 1976, a note dated 1 June 1976 was sent to Denmark under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below:

"The Committee has examined His Excellency's reply dated 26 June 1975 providing clarification concerning the Committee's 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 took note with satisfaction of the clarification received from the Government of Denmark, which removed the Committee's apprehension on the possible export of aircraft materials to Southern Rhodesia. It took note of the statement in the reply that 97 per cent of the exports from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia during the period January-September 1974 concerned products as mentioned in Security Council resolution 253 (1968), paragraph 3 (d), supplies intended for medical purposes. The Committee also noted that His Excellency had requested further clarification from the Danish authorities regarding the remaining 3 per cent of the export.

"The Committee would be grateful to be informed at the earliest convenience and if possible within a month, of the nature of the goods involved in the remaining 3 per cent of the exports from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia during the period January-September 1974 and the circumstances in which such trade was permitted to take place by the Government of Denmark.

4. A reply dated 27 July 1976 was received from Denmark, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note dated 1 June 1976 (Case No. 201), concerning the composition of 3 per cent of the exports from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia during the period January-September 1974.

"In compliance with the request contained in the Secretary-General's note under reference, the Permanent Representative of Denmark has the honour to inform to the Secretary-General, that the remaining 3 per cent of the exports from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia during the period January-September 1974 consisted of commodities delivered by the Danish firm Ostermann Petersen Bros., Ltd., suppliers to the Diplomatic Corps, in an amount of Dkr 14,003. The commodities were consigned to the Portuguese Consulate General in Southern Rhodesia, and the export was believed by the Danish firm to be legal. Export of this type was discontinued as from August, 1975 following intervention by the Danish authorities."

5. A communication dated 9 September 1976 was received from Denmark indicating that during the period January to June 1976 Denmark's total exports to Southern Rhodesia amounted to DKr 335,000. That export figure is shown in the table below.

Form III

Reporting country Denmark

Trade with Southern Rhodesia

During period: Jan.-June 1976.

	Value	
	Unit	Amount
Total imports from Southern Rhodesia		
Total exports (including re-exports) to Southern Rhodesia	1000 kr	335
of which: exports (including re-exports) of arms, ammunition, and material and equipment for the manufacture and maintenance thereof SITC 95	"	-

Specify even if nil.

6. At the 280th meeting on 18 November 1976, the Committee considered the present case and decided to leave it open until further statistics were available covering the entire year.

7. Meanwhile, a further communication dated 10 November 1976 was received from Denmark indicating that during the period January to September 1976 Denmark's total exports to Southern Rhodesia amounted to DKr. 488,000. That export figure is shown in the table below.

Reporting country Denmark

Trade with Southern Rhodesia

During period: Jan.-September 1976.

	Value	
	Unit	Amount
Total imports from Southern Rhodesia	1000 kr.	-
Total exports (including re-exports) to Southern Rhodesia	1000 kr.	488
of which: exports (including re-exports) of arms, ammunition, and material and equipment for the manufacture and maintenance thereof SITC 95	1000 kr.	-

Specify even if nil.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below:
3. A further communication dated 12 January 1976 was received from Switzerland, transmitting its foreign trade figures for the period January-November 1975. The figures indicated that during that period Switzerland imported from Southern Rhodesia 1,983,575 kg of commodities worth 16,323,419 Swiss francs (\$US 6,131,499) and exported to that Territory 178,877 kg of commodities valued at 6,785,358 Swiss francs (\$US 2,589,530). a/
4. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the levels of Swiss annual imports from Southern Rhodesia subsequent to the 1966 and 1965 levels. Switzerland had undertaken not to increase its imports beyond the average for the years 1966, 1965 and 1964. b/ The Committee also took note of the lack of a similar undertaking with respect to Swiss exports to Southern Rhodesia other than war materiel.

a/ Switzerland's weighted, average import and export exchange rates for January to September 1975 equalled SwF 2.553 and SwF 2.554 per \$US 1.00, respectively. The rates of exchange for October and November 1975 were SwF 2.665 and 2.651 respectively.

b/ See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second year, Supplement for January-March 1967, S/7781, annex II.

5. At the 267th meeting on 28 April 1976, the Committee considered the case and decided that an appropriate draft note should be prepared, under the no-objection procedure, for transmission to Switzerland, expressing the Committee's appreciation for the reply dated 20 November 1975 from that Government and requesting the Swiss authorities to transmit the figures for the Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia for the rest of the year 1975.

6. Meanwhile, the expert consultant checked with the Statistical Office of the United Nations Secretariat and found that Switzerland had in fact just submitted its monthly statistical report of its external trade for December 1975. The report included the cumulative total of Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia for the year 1975 as indicated below:

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Value (SwF)</u>	<u>Exchange rate (weighted average) for 1975)</u>	<u>Value (\$US)</u>
Imports:	2,307,596	18,809,815	\$US .388194	7,301,857
Exports:	181,984	7,093,941	\$US .387588	2,749,526

7. Consequently, the proposed note was not sent to Switzerland.

8. The figures showing the volume of Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia during 1975 were analysed for the Committee by the expert consultant. The analysis contained the following table which showed Switzerland's foreign trade with Southern Rhodesia during the period 1964 to 1975.

SWITZERLAND'S FOREIGN TRADE WITH SOUTHERN RHODESIA
DURING THE PERIOD 1964-1975

(in thousands of US dollars)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Exports</u>	<u>Imports</u>	<u>Average 1964-1966</u>	<u>Variation</u>	
				<u>Absolute</u>	<u>%</u>
1964	1,503	2,429)			
1965	1,641	5,678)	4,087		
1966	1,890	4,155)			
1967	1,939	3,925		-162	-3.96
1968	2,513	3,483		-604	-14.78
1969	1,540	3,625		-462	-11.30
1970	1,969	4,296		209	5.11
1971	2,851	4,511		424	10.37
1972	3,230	4,582		495	12.11
1973	3,834	7,749		3,662	89.60
1974	4,546	7,352		3,265	79.89
1975	2,750	7,302		3,215	78.66

Source: United Nations Security Council, S/11594/Add.3, 7 May 1975, pp. 32-4
The figures for 1964 and 1974 are taken from: United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics, (Statistical Papers, Series D), while the figures for 1975 are taken from the Monthly Statistics of the External Trade of Switzerland.

9. In accordance with the Committee's decision at its 276th meeting, a note dated 16 August 1976 was sent to Switzerland under the no-objection procedure, expressing the Committee's concern at the increase in the Swiss import trade with Southern Rhodesia in apparent contradiction of the undertaking given by the Swiss Government pursuant to Security Council resolution 253 (1968), and also requesting clarification from the Government as to a similar undertaking with regard to Swiss exports to Southern Rhodesia other than war matériel. The note also referred to the press interview given by the two Swiss officials c/ and inquired what level had been reached by the Government in reviewing Swiss export policy with regard to Southern Rhodesia.

10. An acknowledgement dated 28 September 1976 was received from Switzerland.

11. A further communication was received from Switzerland, submitting the cumulative total of Swiss trade with Southern Rhodesia during the period January to June 1976, as indicated below.

	<u>Kg</u>	<u>Value (SwF)</u>	<u>Exchange rate (weighted average for January-June 1976) (SwF/\$US)</u>	<u>Value (\$US)</u>
Imports:	897,079	7,204,350	.394524	2,842,289
Exports:	51,453	2,036,603	.394657	803,760

12. A reply dated 26 November 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The limitation of Swiss imports from Rhodesia, decreed autonomously by the Swiss authorities, applies to the volume and not to the value. The statistics of the Swiss customs authorities show that the volume of the 'normal flow' - the average for the years 1964-1966 - was 3,858 tons. That volume was not reached in any of the years between 1967 and 1975. On the contrary, the average for that period is 2,771 tons and is therefore considerably lower than the normal flow.

"Statistics of the value of imports expressed in United States dollars give a false impression for two reasons:

"From 1967 to 1975, the exchange rate between the Swiss franc and United States currency went from SwF 4.33 to 2.58 to the dollar. The figures available to the Committee on Sanctions have apparently been converted from Swiss francs to dollars at the rate of exchange prevailing at the time of their publication;

"During that period, the prices of goods increased considerably throughout the world. Swiss imports, however, which had averaged SwF 17.7 million during the period 1964-1966, amounted to only SwF 18.8 million in 1975, 10 years later.

c/ See para. 79 (g) in vol. I of the present report.

"Those considerations also apply to the value of Swiss exports to Rhodesia. Both the value and the volume of those exports have, moreover, shown a net decline in 1975. That trend was still more marked during the first months of 1976.

"The Federal authorities are continuing to watch closely the development of trade exchanges between the two countries."

(247) Case No. 243. Federal Republic of Germany trade with Southern Rhodesia: information obtained from published sources submitted by the Federal Republic of Germany

1. Further to the Committee's seventh report, paragraphs 84 and 85, and in implementation of a request made by the Secretary-General in his notes of 13 January 1967 and 23 May 1969 under resolution 232 of the Security Council on Southern Rhodesia, a communication dated 12 December 1975 was received from the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. It indicated that during the period January to September 1975, the Federal Republic of Germany had imported from Southern Rhodesia 3,851 metric tons of goods for an amount equivalent to \$US 526,000 and had exported to Southern Rhodesia 369.5 metric tons of goods for an amount equivalent to \$US 2,135,000. The exports had consisted of 210.2 metric tons of petroleum products (SITC-Code 332) valued at \$US 101,000 and 4.3 metric tons of motor vehicles and parts (SITC-Code 732) valued at \$US 29,000.

2. In accordance with the Committee's established practice under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 24 February 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Committee has received the communication dated 12 December 1975 (reference: Pol.321.00/1 RHO) from the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitting to the Secretary-General foreign trade statistics of the Federal Republic of Germany during the period January-September 1975.

"The Committee noted that according to the enclosures attached to that communication, exports from the Federal Republic of Germany during the period concerned included petroleum products to the value of \$US 101,000 and motor vehicles and parts to the value of \$US 29,000. As the Committee would not normally accept the inclusion of such goods under the heading of humanitarian aid, it would welcome further information from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany as to the exact nature of the merchandise exported to Southern Rhodesia under these categories, the identity of the recipients and the basis for regarding the material as humanitarian aid.

"The Committee would further appreciate detailed information as to the composition and destination of the remaining exports in question, the value of which totals \$US 2,005,000.

"Finally the Committee would be grateful for the Government's comments on the composition of the merchandise to the value of \$US 526,000 which was imported from Southern Rhodesia during the period and for information on the circumstances under which such transactions were permitted.

"The Committee indicated that it would appreciate receiving a reply from His Excellency's Government at the earliest convenience, if possible within one month."

3. A reply dated 17 March 1976 was received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Even before becoming a Member of the United Nations, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany took the position that the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council against Southern Rhodesia require full compliance. With its Foreign Trade Ordinance of 4 October 1973, passed immediately following its admission to the United Nations, the Federal Government transformed the sanctions into federal law. To control adherence to the provisions of this ordinance, the Federal Government, in 1974, established the Interministerial Committee on Southern Rhodesia. The competent authorities have followed up on all serious information, including communications from the United Nations Sanctions Committee and, in doubtful cases, inspected goods and business papers. Several companies which tried to bypass the sanctions were heavily fined.

"Despite this basic position, it cannot be completely ruled out that the foreign trade statistics of the Federal Republic of Germany contain data not only on medical, educational and humanitarian shipments to Southern Rhodesia but also on business transacted in contravention of the sanctions provisions. Investigations into the nature of these entries meet, however, with legal obstacles.

"The Federal Office of Statistics, which compiles the statistics, is legally bound to safeguard the confidentiality of the data, even vis-à-vis the highest federal authorities. This legal safeguard was adopted in the interest of the comprehensiveness of the statistics. It stands to reason that guaranteed confidentiality is conducive to the submission of accurate and complete information by the parties concerned.

"Aware of these conflicting interests, the Federal Government nevertheless seized the opportunity afforded by the note of the Secretary-General to instruct the federal customs agencies again to step up their efforts to effect compliance with the embargo provisions against Southern Rhodesia. At the same time, the statistics provided added impetus for more frequent external trade audits in cases where violations of the sanctions provisions are suspected."

4. Subsequently, a communication dated 11 June 1976 was received from the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany indicating that, during the period January to December 1975, the Federal Republic of Germany had exported to Southern Rhodesia 453,100 kilograms of merchandise for an amount equal to \$US 2,484,000. Of this export in question, 6,200 kilograms and 210,200 kilograms had been motor vehicles and spare parts, and petroleum products valued at \$US 39,000 and \$US 101,000 respectively. It was also shown in that communication that the Federal Republic of Germany had imported 5,822,000 kilograms for an amount equivalent to \$US 738,000. The trade figures were shown in the table below.

Reporting country: Federal Republic of Germany

Exports (including re-exports) of: motor vehicles and parts
(SITC-Code 732)

During period: January-December 1975

	Partner country code	Quantity		Value	
		Unit	Amount	Unit	Amount
Exports to all destinations:		100 kg	30 923 268	1000 \$	11 067 516
of which to: (Countries of destination)					
Southern Rhodesia	382	"	62	"	39

Form II

Reporting country: Federal Republic of Germany

Exports (including re-exports) of: petroleum products
(SITC-Code 332)

During period: January-December 1975

	Partner country code	Quantity		Value	
		Unit	Amount	Unit	Amount
Exports to all destinations:		100 kg	82 327 888	1000 \$	1 025 736
of which to: (Countries of destination)					
Southern Rhodesia	382	"	2 102	"	101

Reporting country: Federal Republic of Germany

Trade with Southern Rhodesia

During period: January-December 1975

	Value	
	Unit dt=100 kg	Amount 1 000 US \$
Total imports from Southern Rhodesia	58 220	738
Total exports (including re-exports) to Southern Rhodesia	4 531	2 484
of which: exports (including re-exports) of arms, ammunition, and material and equipment for the manufacture and maintenance thereof	-	-

5. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 276th meeting, a note dated 19 August 1976 was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note is reproduced below:

"At its 276th meeting, the Committee considered the above-mentioned case and had before it two replies from His Excellency's Government dated 17 March and 11 June 1976, for which it expressed its appreciation. It noted, however, that a great part of the trade between the Federal Republic of Germany and Southern Rhodesia, including a total of \$US 738,000 of imports by the Federal Republic for the year 1975, did not appear to relate to commodities delivered within the framework of educational, humanitarian or medical considerations.

"The Committee recognized that, on account of domestic legal obstacles, as indicated in His Excellency's note of 17 March 1976, certain violations of the mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia were not investigated conclusively by the Federal authorities. The Committee was disappointed that such a situation was permitted to occur, bearing in mind the responsibility of Governments to ensure the effective implementation of the sanctions. It therefore expressed the hope that His Excellency's Government would be in a position to inform it at the earliest convenience, if possible within one month, what measures and actions had been taken or were contemplated by the Government to ensure the proper and full implementation of the Security Council decisions, as well as against those persons within the jurisdiction of the Federal Republic responsible for the violations."

6. A communication dated 30 July 1976 was received from the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany indicating that, during the period January to March 1976, the Federal Republic of Germany had exported to

Southern Rhodesia 107,200 kilograms of merchandise for an amount equal to \$US 375,000. Of this export in question, 1,400 kilograms had been motor vehicles and parts valued at \$US 5,000. It was also shown in that communication that the Federal Republic of Germany had imported 17,100 kilograms for an amount equivalent to \$US 5,000. The trade figures are shown in the table below.

Form II

Reporting country: Federal Republic of Germany

Exports (including re-exports) of: motor vehicles and parts
(SITC-Code 732)

During period: January-March 1976

	Partner Country Code	Quantity		Value	
		Unit	Amount	Unit	Amount
Exports to all destinations:		100 kg	8 752 036	1000 \$	3 185 380
of which to: (Countries of destination)					
Southern Rhodesia	382	"	14	"	5

Form III

Reporting country: Federal Republic of Germany

Trade with Southern Rhodesia

During period: January-March 1976

	Value	
	Unit dt=100 kg	Amount 1 000 US \$
Total imports from Southern Rhodesia	171	5
Total exports (including re-exports) to Southern Rhodesia	1 072	375
of which: exports (including re-exports) of arms, ammunition, and material and equipment for the manufacture and maintenance thereof	-	-

7. A further communication dated 15 September 1976 was received from the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany indicating that during the period January to June 1976, the Federal Republic of Germany had exported to Southern Rhodesia 124,100 kilograms of merchandise for an amount equal to \$US 709,000. Of this export in question, 2,200 kilograms had been motor vehicles and parts valued at \$US 9,000. It was also shown in that communication that the Federal Republic of Germany had imported 832,500 kilograms for an amount equivalent to \$US 142,000. The trade figures were shown in the table below.

Form II

Reporting country: Federal Republic of Germany

Exports (including re-exports) of: motor vehicles and parts
(SITC-Code 732)

During period: January-June 1976

	Partner Country Code	Quantity		Value	
		Unit	Amount	Unit	Amount
Exports to all destinations:		100 kg	18 235 258	1000 \$	6 634 006
of which to: (Countries of destination)					
Southern Rhodesia	382	"	22	"	9

Form III

Reporting country: Federal Republic of Germany

Trade with Southern Rhodesia

During period: January-June 1976

	Value	
	Unit dt=100 kg	Amount 1 000 US \$
Total imports from Southern Rhodesia	8 325	142
Total exports (including re-exports) to Southern Rhodesia	1 241	709
of which: exports (including re-exports) of arms, ammunition, and material and equipment for the manufacture and maintenance thereof	-	-

(252) Case No. 272. Shipment of milk powder to Southern Rhodesia - "Tugelaland":
Federal Republic of Germany note dated 10 March 1975

1. By a note dated 10 March 1975, the Federal Republic of Germany reported information concerning an authorized shipment of milk powder from Hamburg to Beira. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"The Federal Republic of Germany has authorized shipment from Hamburg to Beira by the German vessel Tugelaland of three tons of milk powder which according to the forwarded shipping documents are a gift from the Swiss Government to the Salvation Army in aid of people in need in Southern Rhodesia. This decision is considered to be in accordance with resolution 253 (1968), paragraph 3 (d) and (e)."

2. In accordance with the Committee's decision at its 276th meeting, a note dated 16 August 1976 was sent to the Swiss Government under the no-objection procedure, requesting it to ask the Salvation Army for information regarding the distribution of the milk powder and to transmit the Salvation Army's reply to the Committee.

3. A reply dated 14 October 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the /Secretary-General's/ note of 16 August 1976 concerning the three tons of powdered milk donated by the Swiss Government which have been distributed to needy persons in Southern Rhodesia by the Salvation Army.

"The Swiss Government makes an annual donation of a certain quantity of powdered milk to international relief organizations, among which is the World Council of Churches. The latter redistributes its share to other agencies, including the Salvation Army, which decided to pass on three tons of the milk to its representative in Salisbury.

"This agency's report on its activities shows that those who benefited from the aid were elderly persons and persons without families."

4. At the 281st meeting on 24 November 1976, the Committee decided to consider the case closed.

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, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A third reminder was sent to Switzerland on 26 January 1976.
4. A reply dated 1 June 1976 was received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigation undertaken by the Swiss authorities does not show that the three firms named by the Secretary-General, Sublistatic SA, Altradico SA and J. G. Nef and Co., Ltd. - are branches in Switzerland of the Netherlands firm of Joba/Zephyr. Although the said three firms may have maintained certain business contacts with the Amsterdam company, they state that those contacts have long since ended. The three companies have not contravened the provisions adopted by the Swiss Government on its own initiative with regard to trade with Rhodesia.

"With regard to Société Fiduciaire Lémano, Lausanne, specifically mentioned by the Secretary-General as having a direct interest in the affairs of the Joba/Zephyr company, the Swiss authorities have been unable, through the legal means at their disposal, to obtain information corroborating the existence of such a relationship. The company itself states that none of its activities is concerned with trade in goods and that it has never participated in transactions of this kind in conjunction with Joba/Zephyr."

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 eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. At the 271st meeting on 3 June 1976, the Committee decided that the case in its relation to Finland should be considered closed but that the matter in relation to other parties mentioned should remain open and be incorporated in (234) Case No. 213.

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 Botswana, Greece, Brazil and Cyprus, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 13 January 1976 from Botswana

"The Botswana Government has carried out investigations with regard to the information contained in the IATA Manual. It found no evidence of any bilateral pact between Air Botswana and Air Rhodesia. The only possible explanation of the information contained in IATA is that, when in 1973 Air Botswana applied to be a party to the IATA Traffic Agreements, Air Rhodesia was one of the airlines which responded expressing concurrence to Air Botswana's participation."

(ii) Note dated 23 January 1976 from Greece

"The Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations ... in reply to note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) Case No. INGO-4, of 5 December 1975, has the honour to advise His Excellency that Olympic Airways is not linked with Air Rhodesia through any IATA passenger and/or cargo agreements. It should also be noted that there is no Olympic Airways office in Southern Rhodesia and that Olympic Airways does not operate to or from Southern Rhodesia."

(iii) Note dated 27 February 1976 from Brazil

"I have the honour to inform you that the Brazilian Government has proceeded to investigate the agreement between Viaçao Aérea Rio-Grandense-Varig and Air Rhodesia.

"After action by the competent Brazilian authorities, on 28 January 1976, Varig notified IATA of its withdrawal from the multilateral international agreement with Air Rhodesia."

(iv) Note dated 13 February 1976 from Cyprus

"The Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform that the Cyprus Airways, by telex dated 1 November 1975, advised IATA that they withdraw from the IATA multilateral interline traffic agreements - passenger and cargo in so far as Air Rhodesia Corporation is concerned with effect from 30 November 1975.

"Relevant documentation will be submitted to the Secretary-General upon its receipt from the appropriate authorities in Cyprus."

4. Further to paragraph 3 (iv) above, a communication dated 29 April 1976 was received from Cyprus, transmitting a copy of memorandum No. TS-52/1567 from IATA in which the withdrawal of Cyprus Airways from the IATA agreement with Air Rhodesia was announced.

5. For additional information concerning this case, see paragraphs 4 and 5 of (234) Case No. 213 above.

6. Further to paragraph 5 above, a comprehensive communication dated 14 October 1976 was subsequently received from Portugal in which reference was made to this and the other cases mentioned in the Chairman's note to Portugal of 13 August 1976, as well as to Case No. 173. For the relevant portion of the communication, see paragraph 7 of (160) Case No. 173 above.

Case No. INGO-5. Ferro-chrome imported into Spain: information obtained from non-governmental sources

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

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

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

Case No. INGO-7. Tourism and travel to and from Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by the Research Group for Interparliamentary Questions, Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 Barbados and Austria, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 18 February 1976 from Barbados

"The Chargé d'affaires of Barbados to the United Nations ... with reference to the Secretary-General's note of 3 June 1975 (Case No. INGO-7) has the honour to state that the Barbados Government proposes to take the following action with regard to immigration policy:

(a) Entry into Barbados by a national of Southern Rhodesia will require a valid passport and a visa;

(b) Application for visas for entry into Barbados by nationals of Southern Rhodesia must be made to or referred to the headquarters of the Ministry of Legal Affairs;

(c) The Ministry of Legal Affairs will consider such application on an ad hoc basis, having regard to Barbados' general policy towards Southern Rhodesia and apartheid and the circumstances of each individual case.

"The Barbados Government will also comply with any resolutions which may request the banning of Rhodesians from travel to other countries."

(ii) Note dated 7 April 1976 from Austria

"The Austrian authorities have advised tourist and travel offices to refrain from organizing travel to Southern Rhodesia by groups.

"Constitutional provisions governing fundamental rights and freedoms of Austrian citizens, however, exclude a general prohibition of travel by her nationals to particular countries. Austrian citizens are entitled to a passport and have the right to leave the country to any destination of their choice. Their movements abroad cannot effectively be controlled or supervised by the Austrian authorities.

"As far as travel by persons holding a Southern Rhodesian passport to Austria is concerned, legal provisions enacted pursuant to Security Council resolution 253 (1968) prohibit the issue of visas into Southern Rhodesian passports for entry into Austria. Due to the volume of tourism in Austria - several millions of foreign tourists arrive in Austria every year - ordinary residence cannot, for all practical purposes, be determined in each individual case. It is thus possible that persons resident in Southern Rhodesia but holding other passports are among them.

"In spite of these circumstances travel from Austria to Southern Rhodesia and vice versa must be considered minimal since annual Austrian statistics published on tourism contain no data to this effect."

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

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

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. Second and third reminders were sent to Gabon on 5 January and 12 February 1976.
4. In the absence of a reply from Gabon the Committee included that Government in the ninth and again in the tenth quarterly lists which were issued as press releases on 6 April and 13 August 1976, respectively.
5. In pursuance of the Committee's decision at the 273rd meeting, a note dated 13 August 1976 was sent from the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of Gabon announcing the Chairman's intention of visiting him, at the request of the Committee, to discuss the above-mentioned case in connexion with which a reply was still pending after three reminders.

6. On 19 August 1966, the Chairman met with the Permanent Representative of Gabon and discussed the case in question. An account of that meeting is contained in the Chairman's report reproduced in annex I above.

7. Subsequently, a reply dated 25 September 1976 was received from Gabon, also covering Cases Nos. 61, 154 and 232, the substantive part of which appears in paragraph 16 (i) of (238) Case No. 154 above.

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

1. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth 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 Belgium on 29 December 1975.
4. A note dated 8 January 1976 was sent to the United Kingdom asking whether the inquiry referred to by the representative of the United Kingdom at the Committee's 250th meeting had been completed and the required information concerning the matter could be communicated to the Committee.
5. Replies were received from Belgium and the United Kingdom, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(i) Note dated 8 January 1976 from Belgium

"The multilateral interline agreements concluded within the framework of IATA are open to all airlines whether they belong to States members or non-members of IATA. Sabena is a party to such an agreement. Most of the airlines of States members of IATA have also availed themselves of that procedure.

"Sabena has concluded no bilateral interline agreement with Air Rhodesia. It has no air link to or from Rhodesia. Neither Sabena nor its travel agency Transair organize tours to Rhodesia, nor do they sell tickets to that destination.

"Travelworld, the American agency which organizes group travel to Africa, including visits to national parks, sometimes calls upon Sabena to carry travellers over certain portions of the route. Sabena cannot refuse such carriage to the African cities which it normally serves.

"I assure you that Sabena strictly complies with paragraphs 4 and 6 of resolution 253 (1968). In that spirit, it was decided that Sabena, on the basis of article 9 of the international interline agreement, would enter reservations with regard to Air Rhodesia."

(ii) Note dated 19 January 1976 from the United Kingdom

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have now considered the questions of the brochure issued by the World Expeditionary Association and of the ABC World Airways Guide and are satisfied that neither act of publication constitutes a violation of existing sanctions. They have nothing else to add to the statement made in this context by the United Kingdom representative at the 250th meeting of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia."

6. The matter was considered at the 275th meeting on 16 July 1976, at which the representatives of France and the United States made statements as follows:

(a) The representative of France said that further to his delegation's previous statement on the matter (eighth report, S/11927/Rev.1, annex V, Case No. INGO-10, para. 4) he would endeavour to ensure that the Committee received any additional information as soon as possible.

(b) The representative of the United Kingdom said that in his delegation's statement at the 252nd meeting (eighth report, S/11927/Rev.1, annex V, Case No. INGO-10, para. 4), it had been indicated that the United Kingdom Government had investigated the financial position of the firms involved in order to determine whether exchange control regulations had been violated and that more time was needed for such an investigation, in particular since the two firms in question had denied all financial, travel and advertising connexions with Southern Rhodesia. In its note of 19 January 1976 the United Kingdom Government had stated that the act of publishing information on flights to Southern Rhodesia was not a violation and that meant, by implication, that if the case had been otherwise the firms would have been prosecuted.

(c) The representative of the United States said that the first reply by his Government, as reproduced in the eighth report (S/11927/Rev.1, annex V, Case No. INGO-10, para. 6) had indicated his Government's judgement of what had happened in that case with regard to the United States. However, as that reply had also indicated that the investigation would continue, he would obviously remind the agencies concerned to provide further information and would try to make sure that the Committee received such information at the earliest opportunity.

7. At the 276th meeting on 22 July 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom made a further statement concerning the case, the text of which is reproduced below:

"Members of the Committee will recall that on 19 January my Government submitted a note concerning the brochure issued by the World Expeditionary Association, the text of which was circulated to the Committee on 5 February. In response to the request made to my delegation at our last meeting, the Committee may wish to have the following additional comments on two aspects of this case.

"Under Article 14 1 (a) and 14 1 (b) of my Government's Sanctions Order, it would be an offense to solicit or encourage British citizens to take up employment or residence in Southern Rhodesia and the Government would

prosecute accordingly. But the brochure of the World Expeditionary Association does not do this. It merely advertises the availability of seats on certain non-British flights at a certain cost, including a return journey from Southern Rhodesia shortly after the outward flight. Moreover, the brochure expressly states 'no one ways', in other words, no one-way flights. In other words the brochure is concerned with short, temporary visits and not travel to Southern Rhodesia for the taking up of employment or residence there. Consequently no action has been taken under our Sanctions Order which is designed to implement paragraph 8 of resolution 253 (1968) concerning activities which promote, assist or encourage emigration to Southern Rhodesia.

"As regards implementation of paragraph 4 of the resolution, my authorities have naturally made inquiries to see if there was any evidence that the World Expeditionary Association was infringing exchange control legislation. They have concluded that it is most unlikely that the Association would, by paying for airline tickets, be transferring money to Air Rhodesia. British airlines and travel agents are legally permitted to sell tickets on behalf of foreign carriers who operate services to Southern Rhodesia, excluding, of course, Air Rhodesia. There is consequently no scope for legal action against the Association."

3. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the representative of the United States made a further statement concerning several cases under consideration. The text of that part of the statement pertinent to this case is reproduced in paragraph 4 of (189) Case No. 216 above.

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. Previous information concerning this case is contained in the eighth report.
2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A reply dated 26 January 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have now considered the advertisement by Ian Allan Travel of Shepperton, Middlesex, of a tour to Southern Africa including visits to Victoria Falls and the Wankie Safari Lodge. While the act of publication of this advertisement does not in itself constitute a violation of existing sanctions, the United Kingdom authorities have grounds for believing that in this instance the tour did in fact take place. Investigations are still continuing as to whether a breach of sanctions legislation therefore resulted and, if so, as to what further action by the authorities would be appropriate. The results of these investigations will be communicated to the Committee in due course."

4. A further reply dated 5 May 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which was read to the Committee by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 268th meeting on the same day and is reproduced below.

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have now established that the tour in question was in fact organized by a firm known as Frontiers International of Pearce Hill Road, Wexford, Pennsylvania, USA, and offered to Ian Allan Travel of Shepperton, Middlesex, England on an agency basis. When it was pointed out to Ian Allan Travel in June 1974 that if they accepted bookings for the Southern Rhodesian part of the tour they might be in contravention of sanctions, they made arrangements with Frontiers International to substitute three days in South Africa for the three days scheduled for Southern Rhodesia. In fact Ian Allan Travel found no customers for the tour and so far as the United Kingdom authorities can ascertain no United Kingdom residents joined either version of it."

5. At the same meeting the Committee, after considering the matter, decided that an appropriate letter should be sent to the suppliers of the original information on the case, namely, the British Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), London, United Kingdom, with a copy to Mary Homaday of New Jersey, United States of America, giving them the information just provided by the United Kingdom. It also decided to request, through the representative of the United States, that the matter be investigated by the United States authorities, with regard to the firm Frontiers International in the United States, and the findings communicated to the Committee. The representative of the United States took note of the Committee's decision with regard to the United States firm concerned.

6. At the 269th meeting on 13 May 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement covering several matters. In connexion with the present case, he said that his delegation was making appropriate inquiries of the Department of State concerning the matter of the Ian Allan Travel mentioned at the previous meeting and a reply would be forthcoming. Furthermore, he pointed out that in his speech at Lusaka, Zambia, Secretary of State Kissinger had said, inter alia, that the United States would inform American citizens that it had no official representation in Rhodesia and no means of providing them with assistance or protection. American travellers would be advised against entering Rhodesia and Americans resident there would be urged to leave. All diplomatic posts and passport issuing agencies in the United States had been requested to bring to the attention of all potential American travellers to Southern Rhodesia the fact that, because of the unsettled conditions within Southern Rhodesia, the potential in the foreseeable future for increased violence, the lack of official United States representation there and consequent inability to provide assistance or protection, the Department of State strongly advised American citizens not to travel to or within Southern Rhodesia. For the same reasons, the Department urged American citizens resident in Rhodesia to exercise extreme caution and to make contingency plans for an orderly departure in the event of a major deterioration of the security situation there.

7. In accordance with the Committee's decision taken at the 268th meeting, appropriate letters dated 9 June 1976 were sent by the Chairman as indicated in paragraph 5 above.

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, France

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

2. Additional information regarding the action taken on the case since the submission of that report is given below.
3. A second reminder was sent to France on 17 February 1976.
4. A reply dated 25 March 1976 was received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As the French delegation stated on 17 July 1975 in the Committee on sanctions, the French Government points out that the facts referred to in the original note in Case No. INGO-12 took place between 1971 and 1974. The note in question was itself dated August 1974.

"The French Government has nevertheless undertaken a thorough inquiry with the various enterprises implicated in that communication. Although it has been unable to establish proof that any violations had actually occurred, it has nevertheless drawn attention to the very strict instructions issued in this matter.

"The French Government wishes to renew to the Secretary-General its assurance that it remains determined to intervene most strongly in any case where a violation of the sanctions against Rhodesia can be proved. The French delegation will not fail to transmit immediately to its Government any item of additional information which it may receive with respect to Case No. INGO-12."

Case No. INGO-13. Mining operations in Southern Rhodesia by Canadian-owned companies: information supplied by the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility, Toronto, Canada

1. A letter with two enclosures was received from a non-governmental organization by the name of Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility, Toronto, Canada. The text of that letter and enclosures are as follows:

"Please find enclosed a letter from us to the chief investigating officer responsible for Canadian economic sanctions against Rhodesia dated 17 April 1975. This letter is self-explanatory. In response, we have received two letters from Mr. Evans, one dated 5 May and the second dated 4 September 1975 assuring us that an investigation is proceeding. We have just reminded Mr. Evans that, as yet, we have not received a final determination from his office.

"We are writing to you today to put the matter before your Committee and to urge you and your associates to contact the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the Hon. Donald Jamieson, Place de Ville, 112 Kent Street, Ottawa, in order to elicit a response to your inquiry. We would be most grateful to have your reaction and to be informed of any action your Committee will initiate."

- (i) Text of the letter to the Chief investigating officer responsible for Canadian sanctions against Southern Rhodesia

"At the annual general meeting of Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd., a question was raised by a proxy holder of one of the Catholic orders holding

shares in that Corporation in regard to page 32 of the annual report, which we enclose. This item refers to the Corporation's wholly-owned subsidiary in Rhodesia, the Blanket Mine (Private), Ltd. The question raised referred to the dividends paid to Canadian shareholders on the earnings of this mine and the legality of that transaction in the light of the Canada United Nations Act, United Nations Rhodesia Regulations, P.C. 1968 - 2339 of 20 December 1968. (The Canada Gazette, part II, 8 January, vol. 103, No. 1).

"The following is the text of the proxy holder's question: 'Is Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd., aware of the Canadian Order in Council pertaining to economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and if so has Falconbridge received a written notification from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, exempting it from the application of mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia?'

"Mr. Marsh Cooper, President and Managing Director of Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd., explained that the corporation has been in touch with the Canadian Government in regard to its mining operations in Rhodesia and that no transfer of funds is taking place. He went on to say that the Blanket Mine is operated by South African and European personnel and that no Canadian staff is involved and that Falconbridge is therefore not contravening Canadian Rhodesian Regulations under the United Nations Act.

"It seems to us that at least the spirit of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) pertaining to mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia is subverted by the device used by Falconbridge to hold its Falconbridge shares of the Blanket Mine (Private), Ltd., through Ventures of Africa, Ltd., which is also a wholly-owned subsidiary of Falconbridge. It appears therefore that the source of dividends paid to Canadian shareholders from earnings of Blanket Mine is being blurred by the injection of ventures of Africa, Ltd., into the bookkeeping process. We cannot believe that the intent of the Canadian Rhodesian Regulations has been fulfilled by this circumvention. Further, we would like to know whether Falconbridge's subsidiary in Rhodesia is insured through the Canadian Export Development Corporation.

"We would like to draw your attention to this matter and would ask you to investigate the legality and propriety or otherwise of Falconbridge's continued mining operations in Rhodesia. We look forward to hearing from you."

"Cc and encl. to: Mr. F. A. Philbrook, MP for Halton Riding
Mr. Andrew Brewin, MP for Greenwood
Mr. David MacDonald, MP for Egmont
Mr. John Rodriguez, MP for Nickel Belt
Mr. Floyd Laughren, MPP for Nickel Belt
Mr. M. Dupuy, Asst. Undersecretary, External Affairs
Mr. Maurice Dupras, Chairperson, Committee on External Affairs and National Defence."

(ii) Extract from Falconbridge Nickel Mines Limited annual report 1974,
page 32

Falconbridge Nickel Mines Limited
 Major subsidiary and
 associated companies

Blanket Mine (Private) Limited

Although tons milled during the year increased to 161,000 compared to 159,000 in 1973, gold production decreased by 5,359 ounces to 22,201 ounces. This decrease in ounces was more than offset by the higher price received for gold during the year with the result that earnings for the year increased to Rhodesian \$824,000 from Rhodesian \$606,000 in 1973.

Exploration diamond drilling of pillars and blocks in the vicinity of the old workings in the upper part of the mine was successful in adding 130,000 tons to ore reserves. Exploration at depth returned some interesting gold values and this will be followed up in 1975. The dewatering of the old workings on the Feudal mine was completed and shaft sinking was started at the bottom of the old shaft.

Capitalization	As at 31 December 1974		
	Outstanding	Held by Falconbridge*	
Common shares	9,208	9,208	100%

* Through wholly owned subsidiary
 Ventures of Africa Limited

Production	Year ended 31 December	
	1974	1973
Ore milled - tons	161,000	159,000
Ounces of gold produced	22,201	27,580

Financial (Rhodesian \$1.00 equals Cdn. \$1.72 at 31 Dec. 1974)	Year ended 31 December	
	1974	1973
Net revenue from bullion produced	F\$ 2,027,000	R\$ 1,586,000
Earnings before depreciation	909,000	674,000
Earnings after all charges	824,000	606,000
Dividends paid	720,000	
Working capital	705,000	653,000

Falconbridge interest* in	Per share of Falconbridge	
Earnings after all charges	R\$ 824,000	R\$.17
Dividends paid	<u>720,000</u>	<u>.15</u>
Excess of earnings over dividends	R\$ <u>104,000</u>	R\$ <u>.02</u>

* Only dividends received by Falconbridge are reflected in consolidated earnings.

Management 1974
 Managing Director H. H. Bird
 Mine Manager A. Ryan

2. An acknowledgement was sent to the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility, Toronto, Canada.

3. In accordance with the Committee's decision under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 23 March 1976 was sent to Canada, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has received a letter with two enclosures from the Co-ordinator of the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility of Toronto, Canada, concerning a matter of dividends earned from mining operations in Southern Rhodesia by firms reported to be wholly owned by a Canadian concern. The question is said to have been raised with the appropriate authorities of the Canadian Government, apparently without a substantive reply. A copy of the letter from the organization and copies of its enclosures are herewith attached for ease of reference.

"The Committee would be most interested in receiving, at the earliest convenience, the findings of the investigations reported to have been undertaken on the matter by the appropriate Government authorities and the comments thereon."

4. An acknowledgement dated 30 March 1976 was received from Canada.

5. A first reminder was sent to Canada on 25 May 1976.

6. A further acknowledgement was received from Canada stating that the question was under investigation by the Canadian authorities, who expected to be able to provide a substantive reply before 18 June 1976.

7. A copy of a letter dated 14 June 1976, addressed to the Chief, Export and Import Permits Division, Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce of the Government of Canada, by the Chairperson of the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility, Ontario, Canada, was received by the Chairman of the Committee. The substantive text of the letter is reproduced below:

"I am responding to your letter of 1 June regarding the conclusions reached from the investigation undertaken by you regarding possible sanction violation by Falconbridge through its subsidiary in Rhodesia, Blanket Mine (Private), Ltd. You have found during the 14 months' investigation that Falconbridge has violated neither the spirit nor the wording of the United Nations Security Council resolution nor the Canadian Rhodesia Regulations as these refer only to further investment, not withdrawal of profits.

"The wording of your final conclusion gives the impression that a straightforward case was involved. We are puzzled why it took this long period of time, questions in the House of Commons and the hearing of the Royal Commission on Corporate Concentration to arrive at this conclusion. In particular, we look forward to some detailed explanation on the following points:

"1. In its 1974 annual report, Falconbridge lists Blanket Mine as a 100 per cent Falconbridge subsidiary, the interest of which is held by

Ventures of Africa, Ltd., in turn listed as a wholly owned subsidiary. Thus, both of these are stated to be Canadian companies and would come under the Canadian Order-in-Council. It would interest us to know whether Blanket Mines, through Ventures of Africa, Ltd., has received transfers of outside funds which would constitute a violation of the mandatory economic sanctions. Your letter does not deal with the question of whether Ventures of Africa, Ltd., is indeed, as Falconbridge states, a wholly owned Falconbridge subsidiary or whether Falconbridge's 1974 annual report gave incorrect information. We would appreciate your answer to this question.

"2. If, as the 1974 annual report states, Canadian shareholders are in receipt of dividends earned by Blanket Mines - African Ventures, it would suggest that some profitable transaction is taking place to the benefit of the Rhodesian economy, thus, we maintain, violating the spirit, at least, of Security Council resolution 253 by making 'available to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia or to any commercial, industrial ... undertaking ... in Southern Rhodesia ... funds or ... other financial or economic resources ...'

"Your letter does not cover the question of whether goods from Blanket Mines have been shipped out of Rhodesia through Ventures of Africa or any other channels. It seems to us entirely likely that there have been international sales. If there have been and if Blanket Mines and Ventures of Africa are indeed wholly owned subsidiaries (and we await your specific written assessment of this) sales from these operations would appear to be covered by the Canada Rhodesia Regulations (section 5-7).

"Again, your letter does not answer these questions, nor indeed whether the statement in Falconbridge's 1974 annual report on the payment of dividends to Canadian shareholders was correct. We would appreciate receiving your detailed findings on these questions.

"3. In this connexion, we might also ask whether the payment of taxes by a wholly owned Canadian subsidiary to the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia does not also violate the above quoted section of Security Council resolution 253 and the Canadian Order-in-Council. Falconbridge stated clearly at its 1976 annual meeting that it pays taxes to the illegal régime. We request your assessment of this question.

"You may know that the 1975 annual report of Falconbridge omits altogether any reporting on its Blanket Mine subsidiary. When asked why this profitable operation received no financial reporting, the Chairman informed the shareholders that Falconbridge had received no information because Blanket Mine personnel were drafted into the Rhodesian Army. What steps is the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce taking to obtain the 1975 information?

"Your letter of 1 June, Mr. Evans, to interested shareholders and concerned churches and citizens, falls far short of a satisfactory report of your findings. We have stated in our brief to the Royal Commission on Corporate Concentration that the experience of the Canadian public wishing to receive the service of its public servants on questions that touch upon corporate interests has been almost totally negative. Canada's citizens

when raising questions of sincere and altogether legitimate concerns are unable to receive but the minimum attention, often only after long delays and are denied detailed information relevant to their enquiries.

"Your response, 15 months after the initiation of a thorough investigation confirms the statement made to the Royal Commission. We are thus, unsatisfied and ask for a detailed report, including answers to the questions raised in this letter within 30 days."

8. An acknowledgement was sent to the Chairperson of the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility by the Acting Chairman of the Committee, assuring him that the letter would be put before the Committee for due consideration.

9. A reply dated 24 June 1976 was received from Canada, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note of 25 May 1976 (Case No. INGO-13) concerning a letter received from the Co-ordinator of the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility of Toronto, Canada, relating to dividends earned from mining operations in Southern Rhodesia by firms reported to be wholly owned by a Canadian concern, Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd.

"For the information and consideration of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968), a copy of the Canadian authorities' reply to the inquiry from the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility on the forementioned subject is attached. The Committee will note from that reply that it has not been possible to take action in respect of Falconbridge's corporate connexions with its Rhodesian subsidiary. This is primarily because the nature of these connexions does not appear to directly violate the prohibitions imposed by the Canadian United Nations Rhodesia Regulations (PC 2339-1968), which reflect the mandatory decisions of the Security Council in its resolution 253 of 29 May 1968. Action, therefore, is not appropriate under Canadian law.

"It is the view of the Canadian authorities concerned that clarification of several questions by the Security Council, if it is considered desirable, would better enable Member States to deal effectively with similar cases in the future. These are:

"(a) While resolution 253 refers to the transfer of funds into Rhodesia (para. 4), it does not treat the transfer out of, or receipt of funds from, Rhodesia. In this regard, the Security Council may want to consider whether it would be useful to prohibit the acceptance of funds if these were the result of commercial activity within Rhodesia (i.e. dividends, corporate capital transfer, etc.).

"(b) Resolution 253 repeatedly refers to and circumscribes commercial and industrial activities 'from the date' of the resolution. This, however, does not adequately treat the question of industrial operations and corporate

connexions that were extant before the date of the resolution. It would be most useful if the Security Council would consider and clarify this aspect of the resolution and its intent. In this respect, it may wish to decide whether or not Member States should make it incumbent upon their nationals to sever corporate connexions that existed prior to 29 May 1968, or other commercial connexions not specifically prohibited by resolution 253."

Enclosure

Letter dated 1 June 1976 addressed to the Chairperson by the Chief, Export and Import Permits Division, Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Canada

"This refers to your letter of 17 April 1975 and to our interim replies of 5 May 1975, 4 September 1975, 10 September 1975 and 29 January 1976, requesting an investigation into the involvement of Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd., in the operation of the Blanket Mine located in Rhodesia.

"In view of the seriousness of the allegations made in your letter, we have investigated this matter thoroughly and we have come to the conclusion that it does not appear at this time that an offence has been committed by Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd., in violation of the United Nations Rhodesia Regulations.

"When the Canadian United Nations Rhodesia Regulations (PC 1968-2339) were established, the Government closely followed the mandatory paragraphs of Security Council resolution 253. While those provisions clearly circumscribe commercial, trade and other contacts from the date of the resolution, there was no requirement that existing operations be terminated. Therefore, as long as the existing operations of Canadian companies in Rhodesia do not involve the transfer of new funds to Rhodesia, or other specifically prohibited activities, the mandatory sanctions are not violated. At this time, we have no proof that such a transfer of funds has occurred or that other prohibited activities have taken place.

"Furthermore, our inquiries do not indicate that Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd., has received transfers of funds from Rhodesia contrary to the United Nations Rhodesia Regulations nor did it appear that the firm is evading the spirit of the United Nations Security Council resolution 253 as the resolution's provisions relating to transfers of funds were directed against further investment and not withdrawal of profits.

"In view of the above comments, we would now consider this matter to be closed."

10. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 277th meeting, a note dated 26 August 1976 was sent to Canada under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of the note is reproduced below:

"At its 277th meeting the Committee considered the above-mentioned case and had before it His Excellency's reply dated 24 June, as well as the copy of a letter dated 14 June 1976 from the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility addressed to the Chief, Export and Import Permits Division,

Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce of the Government of Canada. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the Government's co-operation in this matter.

"It decided to continue its consideration of the issue raised in the Government's reply, namely whether the transfer of funds out of, or the receipt of funds from, Southern Rhodesia was specifically covered by the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in that Territory. Meanwhile, it took the view that, under the provisions of that resolution, such transfer or receipt of funds from Southern Rhodesia was contrary at least to the spirit and intent of that resolution by virtue of the possibility that it might further the interests of the illegal régime. The Committee wished its position in that respect to be communicated to His Excellency's Government."

11. An acknowledgement dated 21 September 1976 was received from the Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations, indicating that the Committee's comments on the matter had been drawn to the attention of the appropriate Canadian authorities.

Case No. INGO-14. Export of military aircraft to Southern Rhodesia by New Zealand: information received from the President of the Citizens' Association for Racial Equality (CARE), New Zealand

1. A copy of a letter dated 16 April 1976 addressed to Mr. Gilbert Rist of Geneva, Switzerland, by the President of the Citizens' Association for Racial Equality (CARE) of New Zealand was forwarded to the Committee by the Director of the Centre against Apartheid, United Nations Secretariat. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

"May we enlist your help in the investigation? There have been strong rumours that a shipment of 14 Air Trainer aircraft, manufactured in Hamilton, New Zealand by Aero-Services, Ltd., ostensibly for a Swiss firm, is really intended for Rhodesia. The aircraft have proven military capability, in fact the manufacturers claim they are ideal for counter-insurgency operations and have sold many to foreign governments for this purpose. The shipment is about to be crated and will be delivered to Antwerp, Belgium, in the first instance.

"The present New Zealand Government has shown considerable sympathy for the Smith régime in Rhodesia, as evidenced by its reluctance to interfere with the recruiting of mercenaries, blatantly continuing here with obvious financial support from Rhodesia - its renegeing on the Commonwealth agreement to assist Mozambique following the border closure, and statements by the Prime Minister, Mr. Muldoon that white Rhodesians are welcome as migrants here (at a time when the Government is conducting punitive dawn raids in Polynesian areas seeking Tongans and other Polynesians who have overstayed their visitors permits. They are being summarily deported).

"The New Zealand Government is also showing a very suspicious reluctance to investigate the aircraft deal, or at least a reluctance to publicize any investigations it may be making. Following the publicity surrounding the

first rumours, it announced briefly that it could find no basis for the allegations. My organization then conducted a search of business directories available here and could find no trace of the consignee firm said to be 'Breco Trading Company'. We asked the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs over a month ago for the address of the company so that we might pursue the matter further. They have hedged on this and the address has not been forthcoming. Meanwhile, the aircraft, worth \$1 1/2 million, are being crated. We have pointed out to the New Zealand Government the strong possibility that this is a phantom firm, acting as a dummy for Rhodesian principals. It is highly suspicious that a \$1 1/2 million dollar order should be accepted from such a mysterious firm.

"Thanks to the splendid work of Mike Terry and the British Anti-Apartheid Movement we have now learned the address of the Breco Trading Company. It is

H. Brenneisen and Co. (SA)
Reinacher Strasse
255 Basel 4053 Tel. Basel 061-346-533

"We would be most grateful for any investigation you may be able to conduct of this firm, leading to any hint whatsoever of South African or Rhodesian connexions including evidence of trading links with that part of the world. Another question would be - is it a very recently established company?

"We shall continue, in the meantime, demanding further government action here and we are preparing to demonstrate outside the aircraft company and try to follow the consignment right through to its ultimate destination.

"Please make any public announcements you think fit on the contents of this letter or on any discoveries you may make. Time is of the essence and overseas announcements have greater effect on our Government than any complaint which we make.

"Sincerely,

Tom Newnham (President)

"Copies to: Mike Terry, Anti-Apartheid Movement,
89 Charlotte St. London W1P 2 DQ

"Rhodesian Sanctions Section,
Commonwealth Secretariat,
Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London

"E. S. Reddy,
Centre Against Apartheid, United Nations, NY"

2. A telegram addressed to the Chairman on behalf of the National Anti-Apartheid Committee (NAAC) of New Zealand was also received on 7 May 1976, the text of which is reproduced below:

"On behalf National Anti-Apartheid Committee wish to advise possible attempt to break UN sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. We have reliable

reports which indicate that 14 air-trainer aircraft manufactured in Hamilton New Zealand are being shipped to Swiss trading Co. named Breco for shipment to Smith régime.

"We have raised matter New Zealand Government but their action to date leaves us concerned have therefore requested assistance trade union movement and anti-apartheid activists to prevent shipment of aircraft which is planned for about four weeks hence.

"We request your Committee investigate matter urgently by requesting report New Zealand Government from their Mission to United Nations and also from Swiss Government. Letter follows with addition information. If you require further urgent information please telex us care NZ 3813.

"CUTHBERT, Chairman NAAC"

3. Acknowledgements were sent to the President of CARE on 6 May and to the Chairman of NAAC on 11 May 1976, respectively.

4. In accordance with the Committee's established practice, notes were prepared for transmission to Belgium, New Zealand, and Switzerland, under the no-objection procedure, inviting those Governments' comments on the matter. However, before the notes could be sent, a letter dated 20 May 1976 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on the matter was received from the Permanent Representative of New Zealand to the United Nations, as a result of which the proposed notes were not sent. The texts of the New Zealand letter and its enclosure are reproduced below.

Text of the letter

"I have been instructed by my Government to draw to your attention a statement issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand, the Hon. B. E. Talboys, on 19 May 1976, concerning reports that a number of aircraft manufactured in New Zealand for export might be destined for Southern Rhodesia.

"I should be grateful if you would arrange for this statement to be circulated to all members of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council as a matter of urgency."

Text of the enclosure

"Export of aircraft

Statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand,
Hon. B. E. Talboys, on 19 May 1976

"The Government is taking steps to prevent the export of aircraft from New Zealand to Rhodesia.

"Some time ago the international magazine Flight published an article saying that the Rhodesian Air Force was to receive a number of Airtrainer

aircraft." said Mr. Talboys. "Since then there has been a steady stream of rumours that the 14 Airtrainers being built by Aerospace Industries Limited in Hamilton for a Swiss company are, in fact, destined for Rhodesia.

"The Government has investigated these allegations carefully." the Minister went on. "Its investigations revealed that Aerospace Industries Limited had been informed by its Swiss client that the aircraft were intended for a flying training school that was to be set up to train pilots for the Middle East.

"The Government arranged for the New Zealand Ambassador in Bonn to visit Berne and to raise the question with the Swiss authorities. We received the following reply from the Swiss Government:

"The investigations in Switzerland have revealed that the competent Swiss authorities have received no application for the import of 14 New Zealand aircraft of the type CT-4-Airtrainer in accordance with the (Federal law on war materiel) of 30 June 1972 from any side. Nor has entry of these aircraft in the Swiss aircraft register been requested. There can be no doubt that no such registration will be made in the future either.

"The Swiss Government's reply does not prove that the Airtrainers being built in Hamilton were intended for Rhodesia", Mr. Talboys pointed out. "It does, however, cast serious doubt on the explanation given to Aerospace Industries Limited at the time when the order was placed, and the Government now feels obliged to take action.

"As a Member of the United Nations, New Zealand has a clear-cut obligation to prevent the supply of any goods from this country to Rhodesia. The export of any goods to Rhodesia, whether directly or indirectly, is also explicitly prohibited by New Zealand law. The Sanctions Regulations introduced in 1968 under the United Nations Act provide that if there is any reason to suspect that any goods are being exported to Rhodesia they may be detained.

"In the light of the message received from the Swiss Government, and of the allegations that have been made publicly, the Government has decided that permission will not be granted for the export of the 14 Airtrainers at present under construction unless and until Aerospace Industries Limited can supply convincing proof that the final destination of these aircraft is some place other than Rhodesia.

"The Government appreciates that its decision will have serious implications for Aerospace Industries Limited, and will be prepared to discuss them with the Company."

5. An acknowledgement was sent by the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of New Zealand on the same day.

6. Additional information on the matter was received from New Zealand, as indicated in the letter below addressed to the Chairman.

Letter dated 24 May 1976 from the Permanent Representative
of New Zealand to the United Nations

"With reference to my letter of 20 May, I wish to draw to your attention a further statement issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand, the Honourable B. E. Talboys, on 21 May 1976, concerning reports that a number of aircraft manufactured in New Zealand for export might be destined for Southern Rhodesia.

"I should be grateful if you would arrange for this statement to be circulated to all members of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council."

Text of the enclosure

"Export of aircraft

"Statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs
of New Zealand, Hon. B. E. Talboys, on
21 May 1976

"The British statement makes it clear that the Airtrainers ordered by a Swiss firm were in fact destined for Rhodesia", said the Minister of Foreign Affairs (the Hon. B. E. Talboys), today.

"Earlier the British Government issued a statement in London saying it was satisfied that the Airtrainers had been ordered 'on behalf of Rhodesian interests'.

"The British Government would not have made such a statement unless it was completely sure of the facts, the Minister pointed out.

"We accept the British statement as conclusive evidence that the aircraft were in fact intended to go to Rhodesia.

"As a Member of the United Nations, New Zealand has a clear-cut obligation to prevent the supply of any goods from this country to Rhodesia. The export of any goods to Rhodesia, whether directly or indirectly, is also explicitly prohibited by New Zealand law. The Government therefore has a double responsibility to see that no goods exported from this country go to Rhodesia.

"I announced on Wednesday that the Government had decided that permission would not be granted for the export of the Airtrainers unless and until Aerospace Industries Limited could supply convincing proof that the final destination of the aircraft was some place other than Rhodesia.

"In the light of the British statement there can now be no question of permission being granted."

7. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 270th meeting, a note dated 10 June 1976 was sent to New Zealand, expressing the Committee's appreciation

for the action taken by the Government in foiling the attempted export of military aircraft to Southern Rhodesia, and letters were sent on the same day to the Citizens Association for Racial Equality of New Zealand and to the Anti-Apartheid Committee of New Zealand, informing them accordingly.

8. Meanwhile the Chairman had an informal telephone conversation on the matter with the Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations, followed by a note from the Permanent Observer, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As a follow-up to our recent telephone conversation concerning the case of the 14 'airtrainers', I am enclosing herewith a memorandum recounting the main stages in this case.

"Although the Office of the Observer has not received any request from your Committee or from the United Nations, I wished to communicate these facts to you for your information and for that of your colleagues on the Committee."

Enclosure

"Memorandum

"On 16 March of this year, as a result of rumours originating in New Zealand, the Swiss authorities, acting on the basis of legislation which prohibits any exports of war materials to Southern Rhodesia, initiated inquiries for the purpose of determining whether 14 'airtrainers' being exported from New Zealand were actually bound for Switzerland, as the exporter claimed, or were perhaps intended for Southern Rhodesia. The Swiss authorities actively pursued their inquiries during March and April with a view to establishing the facts. As a result, they were able to inform the New Zealand Ambassador at Berne in April that they had not received any application for the import or registration of the aircraft and that, because of the circumstances surrounding this matter, no entry permit or registration would be granted for the aircraft in the future. This information, which was officially communicated to the New Zealand Government, convinced the latter that the aircraft were not bound for Switzerland, and New Zealand therefore prohibited their export."

9. In conformity with the Committee's decision at the 270th meeting and in view of the voluntary initiative undertaken by Switzerland, a note dated 19 July 1976 was sent to Switzerland under the no-objection procedure. The substantive part of that note reads as follows:

"Recently, as His Excellency is well aware, the Committee received information reporting attempts to export to Southern Rhodesia 14 military aircraft manufactured in New Zealand. The transaction would have been facilitated by agents operating from Switzerland. The Committee took up the matter immediately with the Government of New Zealand, which, in turn, instituted appropriate measures that resulted in frustration of the reported attempts.

"The Committee has now learnt from His Excellency's communications with the Chairman that the Swiss authorities, out of their own initiative, had started inquiries on the matter and had voluntarily alerted the New Zealand authorities of the spuriousness of the Swiss connexion, thereby enabling the New Zealand Government to proceed with decisive authority.

"The Committee has expressed its appreciation for the initiative shown by the Swiss authorities and wishes its sentiments in this regard to be forwarded to His Excellency's Government. The Committee also hopes that the authorities will continue to exert similar vigilance in the future against any unlawful attempts by entities within Swiss jurisdiction to violate the Security Council sanctions against Southern Rhodesia."

Case No. INGO-15. Irish hockey team tour in Southern Rhodesia: information received from the Anti-Apartheid Movement, Dublin, Ireland

1. A copy of a letter dated 5 May 1976 addressed to Mr. B. T. Atkinson, Hon. Secretary of the Irish Hockey Union in Dublin, by the Chairman of the Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM) in Dublin, Ireland, has been received by the Committee secretariat. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

"It was with considerable shock that the Executive Committee of our Movement read in the press on 4 May that an Irish touring hockey team, the Harps, are currently in South Africa and intend to go to Zimbabwe.

"This is the first time that mention seems to have been made of the tour. If so, it is extraordinary that it should be taking place under such conditions of secrecy.

"Our Movement has had occasion to write to the Irish Hockey Union on several occasions in the past to protest at similar tours. We can only repeat our condemnation of your persistence in playing against racially segregated teams and thus callously undermining the attempts of the non-racial South African Hockey Board to promote genuinely non-racial sport at all levels.

"In addition, as we have also pointed out previously, playing matches in Zimbabwe provides aid and comfort to the Smith régime and so contravenes United Nations sanctions.

"We trust that your members and the Hockey Union appreciate the real dangers that Irish sportsmen now face in various parts of the world. Collaboration with racialism in sport, especially at a time such as this in southern Africa, may result in those involved being ostracized. We urge your Union to consider this matter urgently, with a view to recalling the Harps team. Needless to say, our Executive is willing to discuss this matter with you further if you wish."

"c.c. Minister for Foreign Affairs
United Nations Security Council Committee on Rhodesia
Supreme Council for Sport in Africa"

2. Attached to the letter was also the text of a press statement entitled "AAM condemns Irish hockey tour of southern Africa", which was issued by the Anti-apartheid Movement of Ireland on 6 May 1976. The statement contained the substance of the letter reproduced above.

3. An acknowledgement was sent to the Chairman of AAM on 24 May 1976.

4. In accordance with the Committee's decision, under the no-objection procedure, a note dated 11 June 1976 was sent to Ireland, the substantive part of which is reproduced below:

"The Committee has received information from a letter by a non-governmental organization in Ireland, the Anti-apartheid Movement, indicating that an Irish touring hockey team, the Harps, currently in South Africa, intends to go to Southern Rhodesia. A copy of the letter which, it was indicated, had also been sent to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, is herewith attached for ease of reference.

"The Committee decided that the matter should be brought to the attention of the Government of Ireland for investigation. Should the information be confirmed, such activity would certainly be considered contrary to the spirit and intent of the Security Council provisions establishing mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. In that case, the Committee would find it useful to be informed of the circumstances in which the hockey team in question may be permitted to travel to Southern Rhodesia. In particular, the Committee would be interested to know how banking, travel and other arrangements are being organized to permit or facilitate that travel. It would also welcome information as to what measures, if any, the Government proposes to take to prevent the team from going to Southern Rhodesia.

"The Committee indicated that it would appreciate receiving the comments of His Excellency's Government on the matter at its earliest convenience, if possible within a month."

5. A first reminder was sent on 11 August 1976.

6. A reply dated 13 August 1976 was received from Ireland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations ... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note dated 11 June 1976 and its reminder (Case No. INGO-15) of 11 August 1976 concerning an alleged visit by an Irish hockey team to Southern Rhodesia.

"The Permanent Representative of Ireland, on the instructions of his Government, has the honour to convey the following reply to the Secretary-General's note:

"The Government of Ireland are deeply conscious of their obligation under the Charter of the United Nations to give effect to terms of the Security Council decision. Ireland has fully applied the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Council on Southern Rhodesia and will continue to do so.

'While the Irish Government have in the past taken and will continue to take whatever steps are open to them to discourage visits to Southern Rhodesia, they are not in a position to prevent private visits of the kind referred to in the Secretary-General's note.

"In so far as the present case is concerned, moreover, the individuals in question, described in public reports as the Harps hockey team are a private group not affiliated with the Irish Hockey Union to whom the Minister for Foreign Affairs has already addressed an appeal in the name of the Government of Ireland to refrain from sporting contacts with Southern Rhodesia in compliance with the spirit of the sanctions resolution 253 (1968) against that territory. The Irish Hockey Union has replied in a co-operative manner, regretting their inability to bring any pressure to bear on an organization or group of individuals which is not affiliated with that Union. The Irish authorities have repeatedly endeavoured to make contact with the so-called Harps hockey team but have so far been unsuccessful in doing so, if only because the officials of that body were not identifiable to the Irish authorities.

"In the circumstances, the Irish Government has been unable to pursue, with commercial and transportation channels, the question of facilities which may have been made available to the so-called Harps hockey team in connexion with travel arrangements to Southern Rhodesia, though it seems likely, in the circumstances, that the travel and financial arrangements would have been borne, as is customary, by the Southern Rhodesians themselves."

Case No. INGO-16. Acquisition of military aircraft and spare parts from New Zealand by Southern Rhodesia: information received from the National Anti-apartheid Committee of New Zealand

1. A telegram addressed to the Committee concerning the above-mentioned subject has been received from the National Anti-apartheid Committee of New Zealand (NAAC). The text of the telegram is reproduced below:

"New Zealand Government Stores Board disposing of surplus Vampire aircraft and jet engine spares. We suspect these being brought by South African and Southern Rhodesian air forces through New Zealand and other middlemen. South Africa and Southern Rhodesia last nations to use Vampire as training aircraft and spares from manufacturers long ceased. Request your Committee investigate matter urgently by requesting full investigation from minister in charge Government Stores Board (Rt. Hon. R. D. Muldoon) and to ensure action taken by New Zealand Government to prevent further sale of aircraft and spares unless full details given to ensure no supply to Smith or Vorster régimes."

2. An acknowledgement was sent to the NAAC and, in accordance with the Committee's established procedure, a note was prepared for transmission to New Zealand under the no-objection procedure, inviting that Government's comments on the matter.

3. However, before the proposed note could be sent, a letter dated 23 May 1976 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on the matter was received from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of New Zealand to the United Nations. The texts of the letter and its enclosure are reproduced below.

Text of the letter

"I wish to draw to your attention a statement issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand, the Honourable B. E. Talboys, on 16 June concerning allegations that Vampire aircraft and spare parts, formerly belonging to the Royal New Zealand Air Force, had been allowed to find their way to Rhodesia.

"I should be grateful if you would arrange for this statement to be circulated to all members of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) of the Security Council."

Text of the enclosure

Statement issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of
New Zealand, Hon. B. E. Talboys, on 16 June 1976

"The Government is carefully investigating the allegations that have been made about Vampire aircraft going to Rhodesia, but so far it has been unable to find any evidence to substantiate them."

The Minister of Foreign Affairs (Hon. B. E. Talboys) said this today when commenting on claims made over the weekend that Vampire aircraft and spare parts, formerly belonging to the Royal New Zealand Air Force, had been allowed to find their way to Rhodesia.

"The Government firmly upholds the mandatory sanctions imposed on Rhodesia by the United Nations Security Council", said the Minister. "We have already demonstrated this clearly, most recently by preventing the export of training aircraft when we found conclusive evidence that they were destined for Rhodesia. Any allegation of a breach of the sanctions is promptly and fully investigated, and the present case is no exception."

"The records of the Government Stores Board confirm the statements made over the week-end by the Editor of Wings magazine (Mr. Ross Dunlop) that only two complete Vampire aircraft have left New Zealand, and they went to an aircraft museum in California. That was in 1973, two years before the present Government came into office. Since then small quantities of Vampire spares have been listed from time to time in Government Stores Board disposal tenders, but all have been sold to people within New Zealand interested in restoring examples of these veteran aircraft for display purposes."

"Investigations are still going on, in an attempt to determine whether any of the spare parts have been exported from New Zealand", said Mr. Talboys. "So far we have found no evidence that any have left this country, let alone that any have gone to Rhodesia."

"Policing the United Nations sanctions is not an easy task", the Minister concluded. "But the present Government is doing everything it can to ensure that they are fully observed in New Zealand."

4. An acknowledgement was sent by the Chairman to the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of New Zealand on the same day.

5. A further letter dated 28 June 1976 addressed to the Chairman was received from the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i., of New Zealand, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"I refer to my letter of 23 June in which I drew your attention to a statement issued by the New Zealand Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Honourable B. E. Talboys, concerning allegations that Vampire aircraft and spare parts, formerly belonging to the Royal New Zealand Air Force, had been allowed to find their way to Rhodesia.

"I am now instructed to inform you that since the Minister's statement was issued the New Zealand authorities have discovered that most of the Vampire spare parts, together with arms and ammunition, were sold in May 1973 to a British firm, Staravia Limited. They appointed an Auckland firm, Dwen Airmotive Limited, as their agents to uplift the goods. In November 1973 Dwen Airmotive Limited applied for an export permit for a large quantity of ammunition. This application was turned down partly because the company's list of possible markets included Southern Rhodesia. The New Zealand authorities have so far been unable to find any evidence that the spares have left New Zealand. They have, however, written to the company asking whether they still hold the spares, and if any of them have left New Zealand, to whom they have been consigned.

"I am further instructed to assure you that the New Zealand authorities will keep your Committee fully informed concerning their continuing investigations."

6. An acknowledgement was sent by the Acting Chairman to the Chargé d'affaires, a.i., of New Zealand on 29 June 1976.

7. At the 278th meeting on 4 November 1976, the representative of the United Kingdom made the following statement concerning the case:

"As a result of the comments made in the New Zealand delegation's letter of 28 June 1976, subsequently circulated to the Committee as Case No. INGO-16 of 29 June, the United Kingdom authorities have carried out an investigation under article 158, schedule 1, of the Southern Rhodesia (United Nations Sanctions) (No. 2) Order of 1968 into the activities of Staravia, Ltd., of Ascot, Berkshire. This investigation included a full examination of all documents relating to Staravia's purchase from the New Zealand Government of Vampire spare parts.

"The documents showed that Staravia tendered successfully on 23 May 1973 for a quantity of Vampire support backing spares. They subsequently agreed to co-operate in disposing of the spares with the New Zealand firm of Dwen Airmotive N.Z. Ltd.

"With regard to the guns and ammunition in the consignment, Dwen notified Staravia that they were in dangerous condition and had been returned to the

Government of New Zealand. (This was subsequently confirmed to the Department of Trade by the New Zealand High Commission.) Some other items were scrapped, leaving for resale a large quantity of rotary actuaries, hose wheel bearings, canopy seats, cables, tubes, washers and other aircraft parts.

"Much of the material is still stored in New Zealand and some in the United Kingdom. According to Staravia's records, sales have been made to two British companies and five foreign Governments. There is no evidence of any sale or attempted sale to South Africa or Southern Rhodesia and Mr. Joseph Goldstein, Managing Director of Staravia, formally denied having sold any of the spares to either of these countries. A check of Department of Trade Export Licensing Branch records confirmed this.

"Mr. Goldstein also said he had no knowledge of sales of these spares by Dwen Airmotive to either South Africa or Southern Rhodesia."

8. At the 280th meeting on 18 November 1976, the Committee decided that the case should be considered closed.

Case No. INGO-17. Supply of oil and oil products to Southern Rhodesia: information supplied by the Anti-apartheid Movement, United States of America, and the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ, New York

1. Information was received from the Anti-apartheid Movement, United States of America, and the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ, New York, consisting of the report of a press conference held in Washington, DC, on 21 June 1976, under the auspices of the two organizations, and an advance report entitled The Oil Conspiracy, a/ distributed in connexion with that press conference. The reports contained detailed information and extensive documentary evidence on how multinational oil companies provided Southern Rhodesia's oil needs through an elaborate labyrinth of clandestine manoeuvres.

2. Acknowledgements were sent to the authors of the reports on 25 June 1976.

3. At the Committee's invitation at the 274th meeting on 2 July 1976, Mr. Larold Schulz, Executive Director of the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ and the Rev. Donald Morton, representing the Anti-apartheid Movement, USA, gave testimony to the Committee concerning their report on the supply of oil and oil products to Southern Rhodesia. The relevant portions of their testimony were summarized in the Committee's records as follows.

4. Mr. Schulz said that the information that he and the Rev. Morton intended to provide at the Committee meeting primarily concerned the role of the South African and Rhodesian subsidiaries of the American Mobil Oil Corporation in the supply of Rhodesia's oil requirements. The information was based on documents which covered the years 1965-1973.

a/ Copies of the report The Oil Conspiracy can be obtained through the two organizations indicated above.

In early April 1976, he had received an overseas telephone call from a person representing an organization called OKHELA. He had been informed that OKHELA was an underground organization of white South Africans who supported the African National Congress of South Africa. OKHELA had indicated that it was approaching the Center for Social Action because it was aware of the research on sanctions against Rhodesia performed by the Center and had asked whether the Center would be interested in developing some material and releasing it to the public. In mid-May he had received by mail from OKHELA a package containing some 20 of the alleged Mobil documents plus a detailed memorandum from OKHELA summarizing the results of its research on how oil reached Rhodesia.

As a church agency committed to the Christian ideals of justice and liberation, the Center for Social Action requested the Committee to take immediate steps to urge Member States to undertake a full investigation of the information presented and stringently implement Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

With regard to the authenticity of the documents, which were reproduced in the report entitled The Oil Conspiracy, he said that it would be extremely difficult for one person or group to fabricate the information concerned. Furthermore, the authenticity of the documents had been borne out by the Mobil Oil Corporation's reaction to the release of the report; if the Corporation had felt that the documents had been fabricated, its reply would surely have been different.

5. The Rev. Morton said that the report entitled The Oil Conspiracy was based on information provided by OKHELA, a clandestine organization of white South African patriots who were engaged in supporting the African National Congress of South Africa. He was amazed to note that several Western Governments with massive resources, personnel and judicial powers, which had known for years that their national oil companies were selling oil in Rhodesia, had for over 10 years been either unwilling or unable to discover how the oil was being sold and certainly unable to prevent the oil companies from operating openly inside Rhodesia. The difficulty, he believed, lay in motivation; if the United States had really wanted, it could surely have prevented Mobil from providing oil to the Smith régime. He also wondered whether the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands had ever attempted an investigation into how their national oil companies had managed to supply Rhodesia's oil needs for 10 years.

The background to that lack of strong motivation for enforcing the sanctions dated back to the United Kingdom's initial hesitancy in implementing sanctions. Not only had Mr. Smith been warned of pending sanctions, but the United Kingdom had had neither a plan of implementation nor a method of enforcement. It had soon become clear that, for sanctions against the Smith régime to be effective, they would have to include South Africa. The United Kingdom, having a very favourable balance of trade with South Africa, had not been prepared to disturb its relations with that country.

He suspected that another reason for hesitancy on the part of Western Governments in the enforcement of sanctions was that, if such action was successful in bringing down the Smith régime, it would then set a very viable precedent for bringing sanctions against South Africa. The huge financial investments that the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, France and other States had in South Africa would be seriously threatened, and their lack of enthusiasm for sanctions enforcement was therefore not surprising.

The largest mystery surrounding the Rhodesian economy for the past 10 years had been how the Smith régime had successfully evaded sanctions regulations and imported a whole range of oil products. The OKHELA documents appeared to have uncovered the secret.

Five multinational oil companies had subsidiaries registered in Rhodesia; they were Mobil, Caltex, Shell, British Petroleum and the French company, Total. Before the unilateral declaration of independence (UDI), they had obtained most of their supplies from Rhodesia's oil refinery. When that refinery had closed down after UDI, they had been forced to look elsewhere. The only economic way of obtaining oil products had been to import them from South Africa - where the very same oil companies had subsidiaries and, in most cases, refineries.

Better-informed observers of developments in Rhodesia had usually assumed that the oil companies there obtained their requirements from South Africa, but had had no way of proving it or of discovering who in South Africa provided the oil products. When queried on that point, the parent companies had been unable or unwilling to provide clarification. In a letter reproduced on page 34 of The Oil Conspiracy, the Chairman of the Board of Mobil Oil Corporation had stated that, following the declaration of independence, "the Rhodesian Government subjected all petroleum companies operating within the country to a stringent set of controls which required them to secure all of their product requirements solely from a government agency". Unfortunately, he had not named the agency, nor had he explained how it obtained the oil products which it then passed on to the oil companies within Rhodesia.

The information and documents supplied by OKHELA provided clues to that process. According to OKHELA's well-placed sources, the Rhodesian Government agency in question was named Genta and it masqueraded as a private company. It was obscurely listed in the Rhodesian telephone directory as "Genta (Pvt), Ltd.", with an address in Salisbury. In fact, it was entirely owned by the Rhodesian Government, and its Chairman and its Operations Manager had previously been civil servants in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Few Rhodesians knew of its existence, much less its role. As the Chairman of Mobil had indicated, the agency did indeed sell to the oil companies in Rhodesia their requirements of fuel products, although it left them to make their own arrangements for importing non-fuel oil products such as solvents and greases.

What had not been revealed before was that, having apparently been told before UDI that they must buy their fuel products from Genta, the oil companies in Rhodesia had then been asked by Genta to set up procedures whereby that agency could import the fuel from the sister oil companies in South Africa.

The documents indicated that, shortly after UDI, Genta had asked Mobil (Rhodesia) to make arrangements whereby Mobil (South Africa) would sell to Genta most or all of Rhodesia's requirements of gasoline, diesel fuel and aviation turbine fuel. Genta would then resell those fuel imports to all the oil companies in Rhodesia, including Mobil (Rhodesia). Other oil companies had been asked to provide other fuel products.

That might seem complicated, but it was only the beginning. It appeared that, because of sanctions regulations, an elaborate scheme had then been devised to make it look as if Mobil (South Africa) was not involved in any trade with Rhodesia. The physical transportation of oil products to Rhodesia from the Mobil refinery in

South Africa had posed no real problem, since unmarked railway waggons had been used. The real problem had lain in the paper work, because nowhere in the accounts department of Mobil (South Africa) should there be a copy of an invoice billing a Rhodesian company.

Apparently, under the scheme eventually adopted, a system that Mobil had called a "paper-chase" had been created, whereby sales and payments would be passed through various South African companies which acted as intermediaries. Thus, Mobil (South Africa) could sell oil products to a South African company, knowing that they would be passed on to other companies, which would eventually sell them to the required recipient in Rhodesia - usually Genta. If Mobil (South Africa) were ever asked whether it provided oil products to Rhodesia, it could evade the question by stating that it sold only to companies in South Africa and that it did not know what those companies did with the oil.

Even if a keen investigator had managed to discover that certain Mobil products had found their way to Rhodesia, Mobil was safe - so long as nobody could prove that there had been intention on the part of Mobil for the products to reach Rhodesia. As indicated in one of Mobil's own documents, if intent to supply Rhodesia could be proved, the parent company of Mobil (South Africa) in the United States might under certain circumstances be subject to penalties under United States law. It seemed that, for that reason, the "paper-chase" had been set up in great secrecy. Very few people had had knowledge of all the details, and an even smaller number had had access to the few highly incriminating Mobil documents in which the over-all scheme had been described.

Some of the documents obtained from OKHELA were secret Mobil reports and letters which dealt with the "paper-chase". For example, document No. 1, on pages 14 and 15 of The Oil Conspiracy, was a letter from the Operations Manager of Genta addressed to the Managing Director of Mobil (Rhodesia). Every four months, Genta sent such a letter asking Mobil (Rhodesia) to arrange the importation to Rhodesia of specified quantities of certain fuel products, to come from the Mobil refinery in South Africa. The term "your associates" used in the letter referred to Mobil (South Africa).

The second flow diagram, on page 9 of The Oil Conspiracy represented a highly complex sequence of sales and resales. The scheme seemed to involve the use of a considerable number of intermediaries, many of which were non-existent companies or fronts for other companies. In document No. 16, on pages 35-38 of the report, the then head of product procurement in Mobil (Rhodesia) explained to his colleagues in Mobil (South Africa):

"The important feature of this plan is that the original billings by MOSA /Mobil (South Africa)] to the two or three organizations in the top line and the subsequent re-billing by those organizations to the second line and ultimately the third re-billings by the second line to the third line are, to all intents and purposes, meaningless and are merely our false trail being laid ... You might consider that the procedure that we have adopted is unduly complicated and unnecessary, but as was conveyed to you when you were here, it is the wish of George's people /A reference to Genta, whose Chairman is George Atmore] that we involve and complicate this matter to a far greater degree than pertains at present in the hope that it will discourage an investigation."

An internal Mobil (Rhodesia) report, shown in document No. 17 (pp. 39-44), stated in part:

"When orders for lubricants and solvents are placed on our South African associates [i.e. Mobil (South Africa)], a carefully planned paper-chase is used to disguise the final destinations of these products. This is necessary in order to make sure that there is no link between MOSA [Mobil (South Africa Africa)] and MOSR's [Mobil (Rhodesia's)] supplies ... This paper-chase which costs very little to administer, is done primarily to hide the fact that MOSA is in fact supplying MOSR with product in contravention of U.S. Sanctions regulations."

Document No. 9, on page 22 of the report, represented an important Rhodesian State secret. The first table showed Rhodesia's total consumption of gasoline over several years. At the time of UDI, Rhodesia had been consuming 1,407,000 barrels of gasoline annually. Two years later, in 1967, consumption had declined by only 20 per cent, despite sanctions. By 1974, consumption had increased to 38 per cent above the 1965 level. The second table, showing diesel fuel consumption, indicated that by 1974 consumption was 56 per cent above the 1965 level.

Document No. 10, on the same page, showed the percentage share of the various oil companies in the Rhodesian gasoline market. It was very significant that, in 1972, Mobil had had 18.4 per cent of the gasoline market and Shell 35.8 per cent.

The role of Shell in Rhodesia was at least as important as that of Mobil and should be investigated fully. For instance, Shell imported all of Rhodesia's Avgas 100/130, which was used by the Rhodesian air force to suppress African resistance. In supplying oil products to Rhodesia, Shell operated through Freight Services Ltd., owned by Anglo-American, and through five other middlemen. That system had been operating for several years. Every three months, Freight Services sent to Shell an estimate of its requirements and those of the other middlemen, which had averaged a fairly steady rate over the years.

The Shell companies in southern Africa were subsidiaries of Royal Dutch-Shell, which was 40 per cent British-owned. Informed sources said that the United Kingdom Government was quite aware of the fact that Shell (South Africa) was providing oil products for Rhodesia. Yet it had taken no action.

Shell had also been involved in a fascinating development in Rhodesia itself. Shell (Rhodesia) had built a lubricant blending plant in Salisbury. It imported rail waggons full of what was called "base stock" - semi-processed crude - together with certain key additives. The base stock came from South Africa, all or nearly all from the Shell refinery. The stock was then mixed with the additives at the blending plant to produce a variety of lubricants. The plant had started operating in late 1974. From early 1975, it had also been used to blend lubricants according to Shell's specifications, which were then put into cans marked with the trade marks of Mobil, Caltex, Total and BP. That process was cheaper than importing all the different companies' lubricants in cans or drums from South Africa, and saved on foreign exchange. For that reason, the Rhodesian Government had forbidden the importation of lubricants and the companies had had no option but to go along with that scheme.

The photographs on page 29 of the report, provided by OKHELA, showed fuel waggons unloading at the "tank farms" belonging to Total in Salisbury.

Without wishing to encroach on the area of competence of the Committee, he would like to hazard a few suggestions as to its course of action.

Firstly, there was nothing that the Committee could not do, provided that Member States wished to take it seriously. Accordingly, the Committee should first of all impress on the States members of the Security Council that everything possible should be done to investigate the disclosures which had been made and, by judicial powers, put an immediate end to further violations. Given the powers and resources of, say, the United States Department of Justice, anyone could stop Mobil's sanctions-breaking activities within weeks. Oil was the one commodity without which the Smith régime could not function. Member States should be made aware of the crucial and critical nature of the present disclosures. He believed that they warranted a special meeting of the Security Council for decisive and collaborative action.

Secondly, the sanctions regulations on such matters should be strengthened to close any loop-holes. It might be, for example, that subsidiaries of United States corporations which were not organized under the laws of Rhodesia - such as those in South Africa - did not fall under the jurisdiction of the executive orders implementing sanctions. If that was true, then the sanctions regulations were indeed a farce. It meant that, even when clear intent, prior knowledge, interlocking directorates and direct payment between South Africa and Rhodesia could be shown, they could still not be stopped. It seemed to him that Security Council resolution 253 (1968) clearly covered such activities, but the question then was what Member States were doing to implement the comprehensive intent of that resolution in their own laws. The Committee might also inquire of Member States whether they understood the intent of that resolution to include national subsidiaries in South Africa. If not, that loop-hole should be closed immediately.

Thirdly, he wished to repeat a suggestion that he had made previously to the Committee. Non-governmental organizations and groups like OKHELA had a high degree of motivation and mobility that official agencies definitely lacked. What they needed was resources. If the Committee could be empowered to release funds for research and investigation in the area of sanctions, he believed that very useful material would be uncovered.

Finally, the importance of the case study presented to the Committee went far beyond the bringing down of the illegal Smith régime. It was now clear that, without the friendly assistance of neighbouring countries like Portuguese-ruled Mozambique and South Africa, Rhodesia would never have survived an oil embargo for 10 years. It was reasonable to assume that in the not too distant future South Africa would be completely isolated, with no friendly neighbours to help it to evade an oil embargo. Recent events in South Africa had indeed shown that country to be a threat to peace. The effectiveness and viability of oil sanctions against South Africa could well be determined by how effectively the facts presented in the present report were acted on by the Committee. It was a critical task, which he trusted the Committee would accept with the grave sense of responsibility that it deserved.

6. At that meeting the representative of the United States informed the Committee that following the statement made to the press by the organizations which the petitioners represented, a spokesman for the United States Department of State had said that his Department had seen the charges and understood that the Treasury Department, as the appropriate enforcement agency, was studying the question of any action that needed to be taken. He agreed as to the seriousness of the charges, if proven. He assured the Committee that his delegation would follow the matter closely and would undertake such further research as was necessary.

7. Also, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that the charge of foreign complicity in the supply of oil to Southern Rhodesia had been made before. His Government had thoroughly investigated similar allegations and had always been fully satisfied that there was no evidence that British oil interests had been in any way involved, either directly or in collusion with others. His Government believed that the report entitled The Oil Conspiracy did not indicate otherwise. However, his delegation would investigate the matter and would give its detailed comments in due course. At the same meeting the Committee decided that a case should be opened on the matter and that the United Nations Office of Public Information should be requested to issue a factual statement to the effect that the Committee had heard the petitioners and would take up the matter in due course.

8. A letter dated 14 July 1976, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by Mr. Larold Schulz of the United Church of Christ Center for Social Action, was forwarded to the Committee by the Executive Office of the Secretary-General for appropriate action. Mr. Schulz was so informed in an acknowledgement sent to him subsequently. The substantive part of the letter reads as follows:

"Enclosed you will find a copy of the report entitled The Oil Conspiracy the subject of which is the role of Mobil Corporation in breaking United Nations sanctions regulations pertaining to Rhodesia.

"The information contained in this report was publically released at a press conference in Washington, DC on 21 June 1976. To date, both the United States Treasury Department and Mobil Corporation have indicated that they are investigating the matter. On 2 July, a joint presentation of this material was made by the Center for Social Action and the US Anti-Apartheid Movement before the United Nations Sanctions Committee. We are informed that this Committee is awaiting the US Treasury Department's report before taking further action.

"The United States voted for Security Council resolution 253 (1968), thereby indicating that they supported economic sanctions being brought to bear on the Smith régime in Rhodesia as a means to the achievement of majority rule in that country. President Johnson then promulgated two executive orders incorporating the essential clauses of the sanctions regulations into the US legal statutes.

"The American Mobil Corporation has been involved in the supply to Rhodesia of oil - a crucial product for the maintenance of power by the Smith régime.

"We therefore respectfully request that you personally urge the United States Treasury Department to investigate this matter promptly and thoroughly and to bring to justice those who are violating both the spirit and the letter of the United Nations sanctions regulations."

9. At the 275th meeting on 15 July 1976, the representative of the United States made a further statement on the matter in which he informed the Committee that since the Committee's previous meeting his delegation had been in virtually continuous contact with the Department of State, which had been in contact with the Treasury Department. He himself had been in contact with Mr. Schulz of the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ. The Treasury Department was taking the case in question very seriously and he hoped he would soon be able to provide the Committee with detailed information on the results of the investigation that was being made.

10. The representative of France assured the Committee that his Government attached great importance to the case under consideration and was investigating it very seriously. He hoped he would soon be able to provide the Committee with satisfactory information.

11. Also, the representative of the United Kingdom reiterated that his Government recognized the importance of the case and had already begun its investigation.

12. In accordance with the Committee's decision at the 275th meeting, notes dated 10 August 1976 were sent under the no-objection procedure to France, the Netherlands, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States. The substantive parts of the notes are reproduced below.

Note to the Netherlands and South Africa

"Recently the Committee received a report prepared and published under the auspices of the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ, New York, and the Anti-apartheid Movement of the US, giving details of various clandestine manoeuvres employed by the Mobil (South Africa) company to supply gasoline and diesel fuel to Southern Rhodesia. The report also states that other oil companies, namely British Petroleum, Caltex, Shell and Total, have set up similar procedures to get other oil products to Southern Rhodesia.

"At its 274th meeting the Committee heard testimony, in connexion with this matter, from Mr. Larold Schulz and the Rev. Donald Morton, representatives of the two organizations responsible for the preparation and publication of the report. The summaries of the testimony by the two individuals as well as a copy of the report are herewith enclosed for ease of reference.

"The Committee considered that the allegations contained in the report, if proved, would constitute grave violations of the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. It decided therefore, at its 275th meeting, that the subject matter of the report should be brought to the attention of His Excellency's Government, with a request that a thorough investigation of

the allegations contained therein be undertaken by the _____ authorities with regard to the role of /the Netherlands: one of the oil; South Africa: the various/ companies said to be involved, which appear to be of _____ nationality.

"The Committee expressed the hope that it might receive at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month, the results of the requested investigation as well as any relevant comments thereon."

Note to France, the United Kingdom and the United States

"As His Excellency's Government may be already aware, the Committee recently received a report prepared and published under the auspices of the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ, New York, and the Anti-apartheid Movement of the US, giving details of various clandestine manoeuvres employed by the Mobil (South Africa) company to supply gasoline and diesel fuel to Southern Rhodesia. The report also states that other oil companies, namely British Petroleum, Caltex, Shell and Total, have set up similar procedures to get other oil products to Southern Rhodesia.

"At its 274th meeting the Committee heard testimony, in connexion with this matter, from Mr. Larold Schulz and the Rev. Donald Morton, representatives of the two organizations responsible for the preparation and publication of the report.

"The Committee took note with appreciation of /France: the statement by the representative of France at the 275th meeting; United Kingdom and United States: the statements by the representative of _____ at the 274th and 275th meetings/ to the effect that his delegation considered the allegations contained in the report to be of a serious nature, that investigations were already underway by the appropriate _____ authorities with regard to the role of the oil company (companies) of _____ nationality involved and that information resulting therefrom would be given to the Committee as soon as it was available.

"The Committee expressed the hope that it might receive at the earliest convenience, if possible within a month, the results of those investigations as well as any relevant comments thereon."

13. At the 277th meeting on 3 August 1976, the representative of the United States made a statement to the Committee concerning several cases under consideration. The text of that part of the statement pertaining to the above-mentioned case is reproduced below.

"Concerning the inquiry into Southern Rhodesia's oil supplies, his delegation had noted the report in The New York Times of 2 August 1976 and all the allegations contained therein. Since the entire matter was part of an ongoing investigation by the United States Department of the Treasury and since it was under its jurisdiction, his delegation did not believe that it would be appropriate to comment on the matter further at the present

time. It would, however, continue to pass on to the Committee any developments which the Department of the Treasury authorized it to report."

14. A reply dated 30 August 1976 was received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, with reference to his note PO 230 SORH (1-2-1) of 10 August, has the honour to inform him that the French Government began an investigation as soon as it learned of the report prepared by the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ on the activities which the Total Oil Company was said to be conducting in Southern Rhodesia.

"This investigation showed that Total Rhodesia was a distribution company belonging to the CFP group, over which the de facto régime in Rhodesia has assumed administrative control. That company's staff is entirely and exclusively local.

"Like all the oil companies set up in Rhodesia before the unilateral declaration of independence, it is controlled and supervised by the de facto authority to such an extent that it has in effect been taken over. Thus, it no longer controls either the manner in which it obtains its supplies or its operations. It therefore no longer has any autonomy.

"The French Government, which immediately began a thorough investigation into this case, reaffirms its determination to apply scrupulously the various sanctions imposed by Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

15. A reply dated 2 September 1976 was received from the United Kingdom, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The competent United Kingdom authorities have studied the report most carefully, and have discussed its contents with the British oil companies mentioned. These authorities are satisfied that the report contains no evidence of sanctions breaking by any British companies or individuals, and have accepted the assurances given by Shell and BP that neither they nor any company in which they have an interest have engaged either directly or with others in supplying crude oil or oil products to Rhodesia. This is the same position as that established in 1968, when Her Majesty's Government investigated similar charges at the highest level with the same companies.

"The possibility that some South African customers of the Shell subsidiary company in South Africa resell to Rhodesia cannot be excluded. In no circumstances would the subsidiary supply oil products to Rhodesia, nor has it ever done so. But it cannot impose restrictions or conditions of sale on its South African customers, because these are prohibited by South African law."

16. At the 281st meeting on 24 November 1976, the representative of the United States made a further statement to the Committee, the text of which is reproduced below.

"On 21 June 1976, the Center for Social Action of the United Church of Christ released a report entitled The Oil Conspiracy, which alleged that the Mobil Oil Corporation and certain of its officers and foreign subsidiaries may have engaged in violations of United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia and the US Treasury Department's Rhodesian Sanctions Regulations.

"In brief, the Center's report charged that Mobil's South African subsidiary, Mobil Oil South Africa (Pty), Ltd., and Mobil's Rhodesian subsidiary, Mobil Oil Rhodesia (Pvt), Ltd., had established an elaborate scheme to conceal the fact that the two firms were co-operating in arranging for petroleum products to reach Mobil Rhodesia from Mobil South Africa in violation of the Rhodesian embargo.

"The Center's report alleged that, since certain officers of the parent firm, Mobil Oil Corporation (US) have also served on the board of directors of Mobil South Africa, it would follow that Mobil US must have known of sanctions-breaking activities of South African and Rhodesian subsidiaries.

"The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) immediately determined that a thorough investigation was called for. Accordingly, on 30 June 1976, FAC served an administrative order on Mobil US, directing the company to furnish specified documents from its records for examination by FAC, and requiring the company to obtain other documents from Mobil South Africa and Mobil Rhodesia.

"FAC periodically broadened the scope of the administrative order to require Mobil to produce additional material as new avenues of investigation were opened.

"In conducting its investigation, FAC has employed a number of approaches, including careful examination of the Center documents and documents supplied by Mobil, interviews with Mobil officers and employees, and contacts with third parties possibly having knowledge of the availability of petroleum products in Rhodesia.

"In addition, FAC is receiving the co-operation of the State Department and the US Secret Service in carrying out various aspects of the investigation.

"The United States delegation will provide the Committee with the final results of the investigation as soon as they become available from the Treasury Department."

17. First reminders were sent to the Netherlands and South Africa on 15 December 1976.

18. An acknowledgement was received from the Netherlands, informing the Committee that the matter had been reported to the authorities concerned in the Netherlands who were currently making a thorough investigation and that the results of that investigation would be transmitted to the Committee as soon as possible.

19. In the absence of a reply from South Africa, the Committee included that Government in the eleventh quarterly list of Governments that had failed to reply to the Committee's inquiries within the prescribed period of two months.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور النشر في جميع أنحاء العالم. للحصول على قائمة الكتب التي تصدرها الأمم المتحدة، أو كتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何获得联合国出版物

联合国出版物可在世界各地区的书店和书局买到。请向书店询问或写信到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 spécialisées du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Publications Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ПУБЛИКАЦИИ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Общественные организации и книжные магазины можно купить в книжных магазинах и в специализированных агентствах по всему миру. Наведите справки об изданиях в книжных магазинах или напишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

CÓMO 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.

Price: \$U.S. 16.00

(the equivalent in other currencies)

03008—February 1977—2,200