



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

SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-SEVENTH YEAR

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT No. 2

UNITED NATIONS

New York, 1973

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/10852 and Add.1 and 2

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
INTRODUCTION	1 - 4
Chapter I. WORK OF THE COMMITTEE	
A. Imports of chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia into the United States	5 - 19
B. Consideration of cases carried over from previous reports and of new cases concerning possible violations of sanctions	20 - 41
C. Cases connected with the question of certificates of origin issued by Portugal and South Africa	42 - 45
D. Actions taken by States in the field of sanctions	46 - 52
E. Other cases of transactions conducted with the consent of reporting Governments	53 - 59
Chapter II. PROCEDURAL ISSUES AND FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE	
A. Question of the Committee's chairmanship	60 - 65
B. Action taken by the Committee pursuant to paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 314 (1972)	66 - 85
C. Action taken by the Committee in implementation of Security Council resolution 318 (1972)	86 - 90
D. New memorandum on the application of sanctions incorporating the proposed new "guidelines"	91 - 94
Chapter III. CONSULAR AND OTHER REPRESENTATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND REPRESENTATION OF THE ILLEGAL REGIME IN OTHER COUNTRIES	
A. Consular relations	95
B. Southern Rhodesian offices abroad	96 - 97
C. Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games (1972)	98 - 108

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
Chapter IV. AIRLINES OPERATING TO AND FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA . . .	109 - 113
Chapter V. IMMIGRATION AND TOURISM	
A. Immigration	114 - 121
B. Tourism	122 - 126

ANNEXES

	<u>Annex page</u>
Explanatory note	27
List of all the cases	27
I. Import of chrome, nickel and other material from Southern Rhodesia into the United States	37
II. Cases carried over from previous reports and new cases . . .	44
III. Cases of transactions conducted with the consent of the reporting Governments	117
IV. Note on tobacco transactions	121
V. Note prepared by the Secretariat on Southern Rhodesian trade for 1971 together with statistical data	126

INTRODUCTION

1. The fourth report of the Committee was submitted to the Security Council on 16 June 1971 (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2) 1/.
2. Since that date, the Committee has held 57 meetings (60th to 116th), and has continued to consider cases of suspected violations of sanctions carried over from previous reports. It has also considered new cases brought to its attention, among them several cases in which importation of minerals of Southern Rhodesian origin has been carried out by a Member State in accordance with the legislation just passed by its Government. The Committee felt that these latter cases deserved the urgent attention of the Security Council and, accordingly, submitted three successive interim reports to that organ.
3. The Committee found it also necessary to change from a system of rotating chairmanship to a permanent chairmanship and on 30 March 1972 elected Mr. Rahmatalla Abdulla (Sudan) as Chairman, to hold office until 31 December 1972.
4. By resolution 314 (1972), adopted on 28 February 1972, the Security Council requested the Committee to consider ways and means by which the implementation of sanctions might be ensured and to submit a report containing recommendations in this respect, including any suggestions which the Committee might wish to make concerning its terms of reference and any measures designed to ensure the effectiveness of its work. The Committee submitted such recommendations to the Security Council in a special report dated 9 May 1972 (S/10632). The recommendations which the Committee formulated in that report were approved by the Security Council on 28 July 1972 in resolution 318 (1972). Consequently, the future work of the Committee will be carried out in accordance with those recommendations and also in accordance with Security Council resolution 320 (1972).

1/ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement Nos. 2 and Corrigendum and 2A.

CHAPTER I

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

A. Imports of chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia into the United States

Cases reported to the Security Council

5. During the period covered, the Committee was seized with several cases of importation of Southern Rhodesian minerals into the United States. These transactions occurred with the knowledge of the United States Government and in conformity with newly passed legislation. As such, they raised a particular problem which the Committee had found it necessary to bring to the attention of the Security Council in three interim reports. Action taken by the Committee in that regard can be summarized as follows:

6. At the 61st meeting on 22 November 1971, the Committee was informed that the United States Congress had passed an Act which under certain conditions would permit the importation of "strategic materials" from Southern Rhodesia. The Committee, considering that such a development might seriously undermine the effectiveness of the United Nations sanctions against the rebel régime, decided to report the matter urgently to the Security Council. An interim report was submitted to the Council on 3 December 1971 (S/10408). In that connexion it may be worth while to recall that the Security Council discussed this matter, within the context of the question concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia, at four meetings (1640th, 1641st, 1642nd and 1645th) held between 16 and 28 February 1972, and that on 28 February, it adopted resolution 314 (1972), paragraph 3 of which reads as follows:

"Declares that any legislation passed, or act taken, by any State with a view to permitting, directly or indirectly, the importation from Southern Rhodesia of any commodity falling within the scope of the obligations imposed by resolution 253 (1968), including chrome ore, would undermine sanctions and would be contrary to the obligations of States."

7. On 20 March 1972, at the 67th meeting, the attention of the Committee was drawn to various reports that a shipment of chrome ore of Southern Rhodesian origin was en route to a United States port aboard an Argentine vessel, the Santos Vega.

8. At the 68th meeting on 22 March, the representative of the United States confirmed the authenticity of those reports. That shipment, he said, was imported under the terms of the new legislation which had become effective on 1 January 1972. He further added that although he was not in a position to state whether there would be other shipments of chrome ore into the United States in the future, his Government was prepared to report to the Committee on a quarterly basis concerning any future shipment.

9. The Committee then decided to report the case to the Security Council as a matter of urgent concern in a second interim report, which was issued on 29 March 1972 (S/10580).

10. On 3 April, at the 73rd meeting, the Committee was informed of a second case of importation of chrome ore into the United States, this time aboard a Greek vessel, the Agios Giorgios. This information was subsequently confirmed by the representative of the United States.

11. The Committee, bearing in mind the whole background of the matter, decided to report that additional import of Southern Rhodesian chrome ore into the United States to the Security Council in a third interim report dated 10 April 1972 (S/10593).

Other measures taken by the Committee

12. Considering that, according to various information, other ships were about to carry more ore to the United States, Governments should be warned of the likelihood of further attempts of this sort, the Committee requested the Secretary-General to send a note to all Governments asking them to take any necessary measures to alert shipping concerns, other carriers and allied interests in their country to the danger of being in breach of sanctions through participating directly or indirectly in such transactions contrary to the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). The text of the note verbale subsequently dispatched by the Secretary-General was annexed to the second interim report of the Committee.

13. The Committee also decided to request the Governments of Argentina and Greece to investigate the involvement in those shipments of vessels flying their respective flags.

14. On 20 March (67th meeting) and 29 June 1972 (S/10580/Add.1), the representative of Argentina informed the Committee of the measures taken by his Government in that regard. The Committee examined the information so provided and took note of the assurances given by the representative of Argentina that the measures taken by his Government to deal with the situation would ensure that violations of that nature by its nationals would not be repeated.

15. By a note of 19 June 1972, the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations informed the Committee that an investigation of the matter was being carried out and that should the final report justify it, measures for penal and disciplinary action against the responsible persons would be taken in accordance with relevant national law.

Reports on additional shipments

16. In conformity with the statement made by the United States representative on 22 March 1972 at the 68th meeting, the Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations, in a letter dated 10 July 1972 submitted to the Committee a report on six shipments of "strategic materials" imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 April to 30 June 1972.

17. The Committee also received information to the effect that two further shipments of Rhodesian mineral products were expected to arrive at United States ports about 15 and 30 July 1972. Subsequently, the Committee was informed that the second of these shipments, made aboard the S.S. Mormaccove, had actually arrived at the port of Baltimore on 1 August 1972 but had been boycotted by the Longshoremen's Union and that a demonstration in support of the Union's action had been held, in which some members of the United States Congress had taken part. It was also reported to the Committee that the Mormaccove had eventually discharged its cargo of 62 drums of nickel cathodes at Philadelphia on 2 or 3 August 1972.

18. The Committee discussed the matter at the 104th and 105th meetings and decided to issue a statement to the press stating the facts of these new violations of sanctions.

19. The Committee also received from the United States Mission a further letter dated 11 October 1972 transmitting a report on 13 shipments of strategic materials that had been imported into the United States from Southern Rhodesia in the period 1 July to 1 October.

B. Consideration of cases carried over from previous reports and of new cases concerning possible violations of sanctions

20. Between 1 March 1971 and 15 December 1972 the Committee continued the examination of 34 cases of suspected violations of the provisions of resolution 253 (1968) listed in its previous report, covering the period ending 1 March 1971 (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2). It also considered 23 new cases brought to its attention including information on attempts to evade sanctions.

21. As in the past, whenever the Committee considered the information it received to be sufficiently reliable, it requested the Secretary-General to transmit it to the Governments concerned so that in accordance with paragraphs 20 and 22 of resolution 253 (1968) they might provide the Committee with any further information available to them. As a general rule, the Governments informed of possible violations investigated the cases referred to them and reported their findings to the Committee. Whenever the information transmitted to the Committee appeared insufficient additional information was requested.

22. In this connexion, the Committee again drew the attention of the Governments concerned to the fact that, in the prevailing circumstances, bills of lading and Chamber of Commerce certificates issued by South African or Portuguese authorities should not be regarded as sufficient proof of origin. It then suggested that additional documentation be sought by the investigating authorities in accordance with the suggestions contained in the memorandum on the application of sanctions of 2 September 1969 transmitted to all Governments on 18 September 1969 (see S/9844/Rev.1, 2/ annex VI).

23. Twice during the period under review the Committee received additional information concerning the practices sometimes used to arrange the illegal export from and import into Southern Rhodesia of embargoed goods through a third country or the means to oppose them. On the first occasion (Case No. 121) the Committee was informed of certain shipping documents which were required by the Mozambique authorities for the export of goods from that country and which therefore could

2/ Ibid., Twenty-fifth Year, Special Supplement Nos. 3 and 3A.

usefully be requested by the investigating authorities to authenticate the origin of the goods in Mozambique (see paras. 91 to 94 below). The second case (Case No. 127) contained information concerning the operations in Swaziland of an agency acting as an intermediary for Southern Rhodesia. In both instances, as it believed that the information provided might help any Government concerned in its endeavour to implement the sanctions, the Committee decided that the two notes containing this information should be transmitted to all Governments. In the light of information it had received from the Government of Swaziland concerning Case No. 127, the Committee decided to seek further details from that Government.

24. The Committee also held a number of meetings to deal with the situation arising from the enactment of legislation by a Member State permitting the importation of chrome ore from Southern Rhodesia. On 3 December 1971 the Committee submitted a first interim report of the Security Council together with its recommendations. When cases of actual importation later occurred, as acknowledged by the importing Government, the Committee submitted additional interim reports to the Security Council.

25. The full texts of the original reports on new cases of suspected violations and additional information received by the Committee in response to its inquiries are contained in annexes I to III. The information is briefly reviewed below.

(a) Minerals

26. The Committee pursued the study of 20 cases of shipments of minerals already mentioned in its last report and examined four new cases (Case Nos. 116, 118, 130 and 135).

27. The Committee decided that two cases on which the information obtained over a long period of time had not produced evidence that violations of sanctions had actually occurred should be closed (Case Nos. 81 and 84).

28. In connexion with cases in which the Committee was informed that investigations had been performed some of the Governments concerned indicated that the commercial documents presented had established that the cargoes were of South African origin (Case Nos. 57, 84, 103, 71, 110, 108 and 116). Other Governments stated solely that "inquiry had yielded no evidence of the shipments originating in Southern Rhodesia" (Case Nos. 71, 110, 102, 107 and 109). In a number of replies it was indicated only that "no irregularity has been found" (Case Nos. 110, 118 and 108), that "the charter contract prohibits loading goods from Southern Rhodesia" (Case Nos. 81 and 86) or that "the charter contract allows goods only from South Africa" (Case Nos. 100 and 108). In these cases the Committee requested further information.

29. In a number of cases (Case Nos. 40, 55, 79, 80, 89 and 95) the Committee had requested the Government concerned to supply further information about the onward and final destination of a consignment, in particular, copies of the documents which were produced to the investigating authorities satisfying them that the consignments were not of Rhodesian origin. The Government concerned (the Netherlands) replied that it had already passed on detailed information to

the Governments of countries to which the cargoes in question were shipped and stated that it would be prepared to forward the requested information to the Committee subject to the confirmation that "the information, which was of a confidential nature, would be for the exclusive use of the Committee".

30. In one case, following a request for inquiry by the Committee, the Government concerned (Yugoslavia) indicated that it had issued instructions to port authorities not to permit the vessel in question to dock in any port under jurisdiction (Case No. 103). The Committee requested further information from Governments concerned.

(b) Tobacco

31. During the period under review no new case concerning suspected transaction in tobacco has been brought to the Committee's attention. The Committee continued examination of information received concerning Case Nos. 98 Hellenic Beach and 104 Agios Nicolaos. No further information was received concerning the other cases mentioned in the Committee's fourth report.

(c) Maize

32. The Committee continued examination of replies received in connexion with Case No. 18 since its fourth report. Subsequently it decided that the case required no further action. The Committee also examined three new cases of suspected violations brought to its attention (Case Nos. 124 Armonia, 125 Alexandros M. and 134 Bregaglia). When the replies received stated only that the cargoes were of Mozambique origin, the Committee asked for further information and copies of the documents submitted. With regard to Case No. 134 one of the Governments concerned (Egypt) informed the Committee that the investigation made by its authorities had been followed by a decision to confiscate the cargo.

(d) Meat

33. The Committee continued consideration of Case Nos. 33 Taveta and 42 Polana. It also examined a new case of suspected transactions in meat (Case No. 117 Drymakos). These cases are still pending.

(e) Wheat

34. Since the submission of the fourth report no new information or new case concerning the supply of wheat to Southern Rhodesia has been brought to the attention of the Committee.

(f) Sugar

35. The Committee continued the examination of Case No. 65 Eleni and Case No. 11 Evangelos as some additional information had been received since its fourth report. The Committee also examined seven new cases of suspected transactions in sugar (Case No. 115 Aegean Mariner, Case No. 119 Calli, Case Nos. 122, 126 and 128 all aboard the same ship Netanya, Case No. 131 Mariner and Case No. 132 Primrose).

Concerning the three shipments of sugar aboard the vessel Netanya (Case Nos. 122, 126 and 128) the Government concerned (Israel) stated in its reply that the certificates of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce in Lourenço Marques in respect of the three shipments attested that the sugar originated in Mozambique. As it had reservations regarding documentation issued by that authority, the Committee drew the attention of the Government concerned to the appropriate type of documentation which the investigating authorities might request. With regard to Case No. 115 Aegean Mariner, the Committee, in the light of the replies received from the Governments concerned decided to seek clarification and to examine the matter further, together with Case Nos. 119 Calli and 132 Primrose which were closely connected.

(g) Fertilizers and ammonia

36. The Committee continued consideration of the replies received in connexion with four cases already mentioned in the fourth report. Case No. 2 "Import of manufactured fertilizers from Europe"; Case No. 52 which described arrangements made by Southern Rhodesia to ensure its supply of ammonia in bulk; Case No. 101 in which the United States Government informed the Committee of action taken with regard to a Mozambique firm suspected of having violated the sanctions, and Case No. 112 Cypress in which the Committee requested additional information from the Government concerned. Since its fourth report two new cases of suspected violation in this field have been submitted to the Committee, i.e. Case Nos. 123 Znon and 129 Kristian Birkeland.

(h) Other cases

37. In its fourth report the Committee referred to information concerning efforts being made by the Southern Rhodesian régime to obtain traction equipment for incorporation in diesel locomotives for Rhodesian railways (Case No. 111). The attention of all Governments potentially concerned had been drawn to that information. During the period under review the Committee received and examined a number of replies or acknowledgements. It then decided that no further action was necessary.

38. With regard to the supply of cycle accessories to Southern Rhodesia the Committee continued examination of Case No. 88 already mentioned in the fourth report.

39. The Committee continued consideration of Case No. 120 concerning the possible participation of a Southern Rhodesian team in the XXth Olympic Games in Munich in violation of paragraph 5 (b) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). This case is dealt with separately in chapter III of the present report.

40. The Committee also received information concerning the supply of medical equipment to the University of Southern Rhodesia (Case No. 133) and a purchase of sculptural objects from Southern Rhodesia (Case No. 136). These cases are dealt with separately in section E of the present chapter.

41. Finally two new cases concerning steel billets have been submitted to the Committee which are still pending (Case Nos. 137 and 138).

C. Cases connected with the question of certificates of origin issued by Portugal and South Africa

42. At the 111th meeting held on 12 September 1972, following a proposal made by the representative of the USSR, the Committee requested the Secretariat to draw up a list specifying how many of the 135 cases before the Committee were linked with the question of certificates of origin issued by Portugal and South Africa.

43. The following tabulation was accordingly prepared.

(a) Cases linked with the question of certificates of origin issued by Portugal and South Africa:

(i) Cases in which certificates issued by South Africa or Portugal authorities were referred to but not submitted to the Committee:

South African documents	12	
Portuguese documents	13	
South African and Portuguese documents	<u>1</u>	26

(ii) Cases in which certificates of origin were submitted:

South African documents	5	
Portuguese documents	12	
South African and Portuguese documents	<u>1</u>	18
		44

(b) Cases in which certificates of origin have been established by other authorities than Portugal or South Africa:

(i) Cases in which certificates of origin were referred to but not submitted to the Committee:

Origin indicated	3	
No origin indicated	<u>7</u>	10

(ii) Cases in which certificates of origin were submitted to the Committee:

	<u>2</u>	12
--	----------	----

(c) Other cases 79

TOTAL 135

44. In this connexion the Committee took into account that in accordance with resolution 318 (1972) of the Security Council and in view of the announced refusal of South Africa and Portugal to co-operate with the Security Council in the implementation of sanctions, documentation emanating from South Africa and from the Portuguese-controlled Territories of Mozambique and Angola in respect of products and goods which are also produced by Southern Rhodesia should be considered prima facie suspect.

45. In accordance with paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 320 (1972), the Committee will undertake as a matter of urgency consideration of the type of action which could be taken in view of the open and persistent refusal of South Africa and Portugal to implement sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe).

D. Actions taken by States in the field of sanctions

46. In their replies to communications addressed to them for their information or comments, various Governments assured the Committee of their support for the sanctions provisions detailed in General Assembly resolution 2796 (XXVI) as well as in previous resolutions of the Security Council. They emphasized that since the imposition of the embargo the measures which had been adopted at the national level in respect of trade with Southern Rhodesia were being strictly enforced. Furthermore, some Governments reported also on specific actions taken by them to prevent violations of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

47. At the 71st meeting on 29 March 1972 the United Kingdom representative drew the attention of the Committee to three cases of action taken against firms which had violated sanctions. A United Kingdom company had been fined £46,250 on 10 May 1971 for exporting goods to Rhodesia. Most of the exports had taken place before the adoption of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), but they had constituted breaches of existing United Kingdom regulations covering trade with Rhodesia. Another firm, incorporated in the Republic of Panama with headquarters in Bermuda, had been fined Bermudan \$15,000 on 16 September 1971 for contravening Southern Rhodesia United Nations Sanctions Dependent Territories Order No. 2 of 1968, which extended to the dependent territory of Bermuda. The firm's former sales manager had been fined Bermudan \$10,000. Two other United Kingdom companies, together with their managing director and chairman, had been fined a total of £6,100 and assessed £2,500 in costs for infringing United Kingdom sanctions legislation.

48. In connexion with Case No. 135 concerning a shipment of Rhodesian chrome to the United States aboard the Santos Vega, a vessel flying the Argentine flag, the representative of Argentina made statements to the Committee at the 67th and 103rd meetings held on 20 March and 29 June 1972. Reporting on actions taken by Argentine authorities in that regard, the representative of Argentina stated that on 3 March 1972 a letter was sent by the Under-Secretary of the Merchant Marine to the group consisting of the owners of Argentine merchant vessels. On the same day, the Under-Secretary addressed a similar note to the owners of the vessel in question. Following an investigation by the competent bodies it was decided to issue a serious warning to the owners of the Santos Vega. In deciding on the procedure to be followed, the representative stated that special consideration had been given to the fact that this was the first and only violation committed by a vessel flying the Argentine flag and that, according to the explanations furnished

by it, the company concerned was absolutely unaware of the origin of the shipment. In addition, the representative stated, the Argentine Government had begun a review of legislative measures already in force with a view to preventing the recurrence of incidents such as the one in question. At the 116th meeting of the Committee, the representative of Argentina recalled that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina had announced in his statement to the Security Council on 28 September 1972 (1664th meeting) that his Government had adopted Act 19846 providing that the mandatory character of the sanctions should continue to be fully in effect in Argentine territory. He added that all government offices had been instructed to adopt, within their respective areas of jurisdiction, the necessary measures for implementation of the decisions of the Security Council.

49. By a note dated 6 July 1972 the Government of Greece informed the Committee of Greek legislation enacted with the purpose of preventing transactions with Rhodesia. The note recalled previous laws enacted by Greece to that end in 1967 and 1968. As a result of those measures, the Greek note stated, trade between Greece and Southern Rhodesia was non-existent. In addition, despite the fact that the Greek mercantile fleet ranked among the largest in the world, there had not been in the past any established case of Greek ships transporting merchandise of Rhodesian origin.

50. By a note dated 10 July 1972, the United States Government informed the Committee of various developments in cases involving American companies. Indictments had been handed down by a United States Grand Jury against four individuals and two corporations accused of violating the sanctions against Rhodesia. The parties concerned had pleaded guilty. Subsequently the two companies were fined \$100,000 and \$25,000 respectively. The president of one of the companies was fined \$7,500, received a suspended sentence and was placed on probation for a year. Three individuals involved in these indictments were fined \$2,500, \$1,750 and \$10,000 respectively. The latter individual was also given a one-year suspended sentence and placed on probation for four years. The indictments handed down by the Grand Jury resulted from efforts by those individuals to build a \$50 million chemical fertilizer plant in Rhodesia and to enter into a secret agreement with the Rhodesian régime to ship \$5 million worth of ammonia to Rhodesia.

51. By a note dated 24 August 1972 the Yugoslav Government informed the Committee of developments in regard to the following. Between 16 and 24 February 1972, while in the port of Lourenço Marques, the Cypriot vessel Mariner loaded a cargo of several thousand tons of sugar and sailed on 24 February 1972 for Yugoslavia, arriving at Split on 18 March, having made no intermediate calls. The Yugoslav Government informed the Committee that, following an investigation in Yugoslavia by the District Public Prosecutor's Office, it was concluded, on the basis of the documents supplied by the importing enterprise Centroprom that the sugar was not of Southern Rhodesian origin. No grounds existed, therefore, for initiating criminal proceedings under the provisions of the existing law. The Yugoslav note went on to say, however, that further investigations and measures had been initiated by the Yugoslav Government, since Chamber of Commerce certificates cannot be regarded as sufficient proof of origin, especially in the case of goods exported from Mozambique. An indictment had then been brought in against the enterprise Centroprom and its General Manager, on the basis of existing Government decrees (enacted in keeping with General Assembly resolutions on Portuguese colonies) prohibiting commercial transactions and trade arrangements with Portugal. In the meantime, apart from the criminal proceedings, the Federal Foreign Currency

Inspectorate imposed a severe fine on the said enterprise preventing it from obtaining any financial gain from the transaction; the case of Centroprom and its general manager was also referred to the Court of Honour of the Federal Chamber of Economy.

52. The Government of Yugoslavia stated that it would have prevented the importation of the said shipment had it been possible for the information concerning the suspected violation to reach it before the shipment arrived in the Yugoslav port, irrespective of whether it was believed to be of Southern Rhodesian or of Portuguese (Mozambique) origin. The note went on to say that, in the opinion of the Yugoslav Government, the case underlined the relevance of numerous requests voiced in the General Assembly, the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations to the effect that sanctions against Southern Rhodesia could be fully effective only if they were applied against Portugal and South Africa as well. To that end, the Yugoslav Government was introducing new procedures designed to tighten the existing Yugoslav procedures for the prevention of commercial transactions with Portugal, measures designed to broaden, at the same time, the existing legal framework for preventing trade with Southern Rhodesia.

E. Other cases of transactions conducted with the consent of reporting Governments

Cases included in the fourth report

53. In its fourth report (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, paras. 45-63) the Committee indicated that it had been informed of three cases of transaction conducted with the consent of reporting Governments. Among them was a case concerning the sale of Australian wheat to Southern Rhodesia. By a note dated 13 December 1972 the Permanent Representative of Australia has informed the Secretary-General that the Australian Government is satisfied that humanitarian consideration no longer justifies the export of wheat to Rhodesia. Accordingly the Government has decided that it will no longer permit the export of wheat to Rhodesia from Australia.

New cases

54. Since the submission of the fourth report, the Committee has been informed of two cases in which transactions with Southern Rhodesia were conducted by private firms with the consent of their Government. Both cases were reported to the Committee by the Government of Sweden.

(a) Export to Southern Rhodesia of electro-medical equipment

55. By a letter dated 7 June 1972 the Swedish Government informed the Committee that it had authorized the exportation to Rhodesia of electro-medical equipment (Case No. 133). The note stated that the goods had been ordered from a Swedish exporter by the University of Rhodesia. The licence had been granted as an exception to the general prohibition against trade with Rhodesia stipulated in the pertinent Swedish Law, which allows for exportation of medical equipment and equipment used for educational purposes. The note went on to say that these exceptions were in line with the provisions in paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

56. At its 102nd meeting the Committee decided that further information as to the nature of this shipment should be requested from the Swedish Government in order to dispel any doubt as to the use which the illegal régime could make of it. Accordingly at its request, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale to the Permanent Representative of Sweden asking for a complete description of the equipment in question and a detailed account of its intended use. By a note of 8 September 1972, the Permanent Representative of Sweden transmitted copies of documents on the basis of which his Government had founded its conviction that the medical equipment would be used solely for educational purposes in the new phonetic and linguistics laboratory at the University of Rhodesia.

(b) Import from Southern Rhodesia of African works of art

57. Also by a letter dated 25 October 1972 the Swedish Government informed the Committee that it had authorized the importation of 14 sculptures from Southern Rhodesia by a Swedish non-profit-making foundation established to promote art and handicraft production in developing countries of Africa and Asia.

58. The licence to import the goods, worth Swedish Kronor 2,900 (equivalent to \$US 614), was granted as an exception from the general prohibition against trade with Rhodesia stipulated in the pertinent Swedish Law (No. 178: 1971) in view of the following special circumstances pertaining in this case. The pieces of art in question were purchased in 1967 and exported from Rhodesia before the adoption of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968. Since their exportation the goods had been stored in the Stockholm free port.

59. According to paragraph 3 of resolution 253 (1968), the letter continued, it is trade with Rhodesia after the date of the resolution that is prohibited. As a mandatory ban was in force at the time of the purchase and export, the instance under consideration was not in contravention of the sanctions but merely the completion of an uncompleted transaction.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURAL ISSUES AND FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

A. Question of the Committee's chairmanship

60. In accordance with the system of rotating chairmanship which had been established on 30 September 1970 (see S/9951), when the Committee was enlarged to include representatives of all members of the Security Council, the representatives of France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan and the USSR acted successively as Chairman of the Committee between July 1971 and March 1972.

61. At the 64th meeting on 13 March 1972, the representative of Somalia introduced a proposal aimed at replacing that system by a one-year term of chairmanship.

62. Different positions were taken on this proposal by the members of the Committee. In view of the difficulty the Committee encountered in agreeing on a system of chairmanship, the Chairman was urgently requested to inform the President of the Security Council of the situation. By a letter dated 21 March 1972 (S/10571) the Chairman (USSR) accordingly informed the President of the Security Council.

63. By a note dated 29 March 1972 (S/10578), the President of the Security Council, referring to the above letter, stated that he had held consultations on the matter with the members of the Council. The note stated further that although a number of members of the Security Council had expressed certain reservations regarding the proposal in question, it had been at the same time agreed by all members of the Council that it was not necessary to call a special meeting of the Council in order to resolve this procedural matter. During the consultations, the note continued, several of those who had expressed reservations had proposed, with a view to arriving at an agreement on the matter, that the Committee should elect two Vice-Chairmen to assist the Chairman at the same time that it elected the latter for a one-year term.

64. By 28 March 1972, the date fixed by the President of the Security Council for completing the consultations on this matter, no further proposals had been made in addition to the above-mentioned one. Consequently, although certain members of the Security Council had expressed reservations in that regard, the above-mentioned procedure for electing the officers of the Committee was therefore regarded as having been established.

65. Accordingly, at its 72nd meeting on 30 March 1972, the Committee elected Mr. Rahmatalla Abdulla (Sudan) as Chairman, and subsequently decided that the delegations of Panama and Japan should provide the two Vice-Chairmen. The terms of these three officers will end on 31 December 1972.

B. Action taken by the Committee pursuant to paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 314 (1972)

66. By paragraph 6 of resolution 314 (1972) adopted on 28 February 1972, the Security Council requested the Committee to meet as a matter of urgency to consider ways and means by which the implementation of sanctions might be ensured and to submit to the Security Council a report containing recommendations in this respect, including any suggestions which the Committee might wish to make concerning its terms of reference and any other measures designed to ensure the effectiveness of its work.

67. The Committee met accordingly and held 38 meetings between 13 March and 8 May 1972. After detailed discussion of the various proposals submitted to it, the Committee agreed on a set of recommendations and suggestions which were incorporated in the special report and submitted to the Security Council on 9 May 1972 (S/1066) together with other proposals advanced by some members.

68. It may be useful to recall in the present report the recommendations and suggestions which have been approved by the Security Council since they now form part of the Committee's programme of work.

Recommendations and suggestions included in the Committee's special report and approved by the Council

69. The name of the Committee should be changed to the "Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia".

70. Information from more Member States would be useful to the Committee. Only very few Governments have reported up to now on cases of suspected violations. The Committee considers it essential that Members of the United Nations endeavour to bring cases of suspected sanctions evasions immediately to the notice of the Committee.

71. In addition to the information regarding suspected violations of sanctions brought to its notice by members and by the Secretariat, the Committee should also seek and may receive information in this connexion from intergovernmental organizations and specialized agencies on a continuing basis.

72. The Committee should also invite, in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, non-governmental international organizations concerned with matters within its competence and all persons whom it considers competent for the purpose to supply it with information, or to give it other assistance and co-operation as the Committee may deem appropriate in the fulfilment of its tasks.

73. Governments should co-operate fully with the Committee in providing it with the information or other forms of assistance and co-operation obtained from all suitable sources in their territories, including natural and juridical persons within their jurisdiction, which are necessary for the discharge of its tasks.

74. The secretariat of the Committee should be in a position to keep the Committee continuously and adequately informed of all developments relevant to the task entrusted to it by Security Council resolutions 253, (1968), 277 (1970) and 314 (1972). It should also initiate any specialized studies required by the Committee with the assistance, when necessary, of other competent departments of the Secretariat.

75. Information from published sources including press reports regarding suspected violations of sanctions should be circulated to all members without delay. The information would be placed before the next meeting of the Committee so as to enable the Committee to consider any appropriate action that might be required.

76. Governments should be urged to give prompt attention to requests for information from the Committee.

77. The Committee decided accordingly to request Governments to reply within a stated period depending on the particular circumstances of each case and in any event not later than two months. If at the end of that period no reply has been received, and two reminders fail to elicit a response, the Committee should consider all necessary and appropriate measures to ensure compliance with its requests including referral of the case to the Security Council. The interval at which reminders ought to be dispatched will be determined by the Committee according to the nature of each case but in no case will it exceed one month.

78. The Committee should meet not less than twice a month and in urgent cases it should convene at the request of any member.

79. As part of the need of keeping the international community regularly informed, the Committee should, at the end of each meeting, consider the issuance of a press release covering its work and matters of topical interest including those cases where infringement of sanctions has been established or prevented.

80. In view of the announced refusal of South Africa and Portugal to co-operate with the Security Council in the implementation of sanctions, documentation emanating from South Africa and from the Portuguese controlled Territories of Mozambique and Angola in respect of products and goods which are also produced by Southern Rhodesia should be considered prima facie suspect. For purposes of investigation, therefore, the Committee should request all Governments to exercise closer scrutiny of such documents and to conduct an actual examination of cargoes to ensure that they are not of Southern Rhodesian origin.

81. In view of the large-scale falsification of commercial documents for goods originating from Southern Rhodesia, the Committee decided that it would resume its studies on this matter and that it should request expert advice to assist in the examination and devising of additional measures for preventing the circumvention of sanctions.

82. For the Committee to be able to fulfil its duties of examining the reports of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), and to submit, when necessary, its observations thereon to the Security Council, the Secretary-General should be invited to submit such reports more frequently, if possible quarterly, including periodic statistics of foreign trade.

83. The Committee should actively pursue all its responsibilities as provided by subparagraph 20 (b) of resolution 253 (1968) as well as by subparagraph 21 (b) of resolution 277 (1970).

84. Bearing in mind the need to keep the Security Council more frequently informed, the Committee should endeavour to submit quarterly reports to the Security Council. The Committee will, in the light of its experience, review this practice after a year's time and decide whether it is appropriate to adhere to it. The Committee will also submit to the Council interim reports when it considers this necessary.

85. The Committee attaches great importance to the question of the insurance of all cargoes of Southern Rhodesian origin and of all cargoes destined for Southern Rhodesia together with the question of the insurance of ships, aircraft, road and rail transport involved in the conveyance of those cargoes. With the aim of being able to adopt any necessary measures in this field, the Committee should request the Secretary-General to make available without delay the necessary expert advice which would clarify the role of insurance companies and indicate, where possible, those areas where, with the co-operation of such companies, the United Nations would be able to improve the effectiveness of sanctions.

C. Action taken by the Committee in implementation of Security Council resolution 318 (1972)

86. By resolution 318 (1972) the Security Council took note with appreciation of the special report of the Committee and approved the recommendations and suggestions it contained.

87. In drawing attention to the action taken by the Security Council in that regard, the Committee Chairman stated at the 105th meeting on 3 August 1972 that the recommendations and suggestions thus approved now formed a part of the Committee's programme of work.

88. With regard to paragraph 23 of the special report according to which the Committee should endeavour to submit quarterly reports to the Council, the Chairman said that the Committee should first make an effort to prepare its fifth annual report. Then the Committee could turn thereafter to the practice of issuing reports on a quarterly basis.

89. Later on, the Chairman, considering that in the last paragraph of these recommendations and suggestions, the Committee had requested the Secretary-General "to make available without delay the necessary expert advice which would clarify the role of insurance companies and indicate, where possible, those areas where, with the co-operation of such companies, the United Nations would be able to improve the effectiveness of sanctions", decided that in order to assist the Secretary-General in this matter, appropriate suggestions might be requested from the Commonwealth Secretariat and the Africa Bureau, both in London. Letters were therefore addressed to these two organizations on 25 August 1972 requesting them to suggest the names of several reputable experts in this aspect of the insurance field.

90. A reply dated 10 October 1972 was received from the Commonwealth Secretariat. It pointed out that a high percentage of the world's marine insurance is normally transacted in London, particularly through various members and subscribers of

Lloyds, or through other insurance and marine brokers. These firms or other independent consultants might be prepared to give advice on the matter if so requested. The letter added that since the activities of the Commonwealth Secretariat do not include contracts with insurance and marine brokers or consultants, it was difficult for it to suggest specific names of such persons.

D. New memorandum on the application of sanctions incorporating the proposed new "guidelines"

91. As indicated in the fourth report (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, paras. 67-70), the Committee, considering that Rhodesian commodities continued to be accepted as emanating from neighbouring territories, believes that Governments would welcome a memorandum which, complementing the memorandum dated 2 September 1969 (S/9844/Rev.1, annex VI) already sent to them, would recall the various criteria for determining the origin of certain products.

92. In this connexion the Committee received a note dated 17 June 1971 from the United Kingdom Mission which dealt specifically with goods supposedly originating in Mozambique and drew attention to regulations in force in that Territory so that when investigating specific cases of suspected violations the competent authorities might request the production of the appropriate documentation.

93. The Committee examined the contents of this note and decided that it should be brought to the attention of all the Governments potentially concerned. The contents of this note was circulated accordingly on 27 July 1971.

94. A comprehensive memorandum covering the above matters and recalling the use which can be made of such means as chemical analysis to determine the true origin of certain goods in order to assist investigating authorities in their difficult task is still in the course of preparation.

CHAPTER III

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

A. Consular relations

95. In the fourth report (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, paras. 71-73) it was stated that all the countries, with the exception of South Africa and Portugal, had closed their consular offices in Southern Rhodesia. The Committee has been informed of no new development on this matter during the period covered.

B. Southern Rhodesian offices abroad

96. In its fourth report to the Security Council, the Committee indicated that it had requested the Secretary-General to seek information from Governments in whose territory the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia asserted that it had missions and other offices, which were listed as follows:

Missions abroad: Pretoria ("Diplomatic Mission")
Cape Town ("Consulate")
Lisbon ("Diplomatic Mission")
Lourenço Marques ("Consulate General")
Beira ("Consulate")

Trade missions: Johannesburg
Luanda

Information offices: Washington, D.C.
Sydney

97. In a note dated 10 May 1971, the Government of Australia replied to the Secretary-General's request for further information about the Southern Rhodesian information office in Sydney. It stated that an office had been opened in Sydney under the name of the "Rhodesian Information Centre" prior to the adoption of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). Under Australian law no authority from the Australian Government was required for the opening of that office, which was a private office so far as the Australian Government was concerned. Neither the office nor its personnel had any official status whatsoever. Moreover the Australian Government did not correspond with the office nor acknowledge any correspondence from it. Printed material imported from Southern Rhodesia for the Centre had been seized and confiscated by the Australian authorities, acting under the Customs (Prohibited Imports) Regulations adopted in accordance with Australia's obligations under the sanctions.

C. Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games (1972)

98. As was indicated in its fourth report to the Security Council, the Committee, which had been informed that the Secretary-General of the National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia had travelled to Munich to discuss the participation of a Southern Rhodesian team in the Olympic Games, approved the text of a note verbale which it requested the Secretary-General to address to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in that connexion (ibid., paras. 77-79).

99. A reply was received dated 10 June 1971 from the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany which stated that the attitude of the Federal Government with regard to Southern Rhodesia was unchanged, and was based on non-recognition of the Republic of Southern Rhodesia and application of the sanctions decided on in Security Council resolution 253 (1968). With regard to the question of the entry into the territory of the Federal Republic by the Secretary-General of the National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia, the Federal Government recalled its decision to prohibit the entry into its territory of any holder of a Southern Rhodesian passport and said that as that policy had not been changed, it followed that the Secretary-General of the Rhodesian Committee could not have entered federal territory with a Rhodesian passport but must have been in possession of some other travel document.

100. The noted from the Permanent Observer further pointed out that the decision as to which national olympic committees would be invited to take part in the Olympic Games was incumbent upon the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and that in March 1966 the Federal Government had pledged to the IOC that it would grant unrestricted entry, regardless of racial or political affiliations, to the representatives of all national olympic committees recognized by the IOC at the time of the Olympic Games in 1972 - an undertaking which had been a precondition for the holding of the Games in Munich. In May 1971 the President of the IOC had stated that his organization was not concerned with the political conditions in a country, that on the strength of the IOC rules and the commitments it had undertaken the Organizing Committee of the 1972 Games in Munich was obliged to invite the Rhodesian Olympic Committee, and that the invitation had been extended in accordance with instructions given by the IOC. The Federal Government had information to the effect that no formal protest had been lodged until that date with the IOC by any national olympic committee against the invitation of the National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia. Furthermore, the Federal Government was in no position to influence the instructions of the IOC, which were binding on the Organizing Committee, nor to prevent the Organizing Committee, which acted independently of the Government, from extending the invitation.

101. On 7 July 1971 the Security Council Committee's attention was drawn to a report of the Secretary-General dated 30 June 1971 3/ on the question of Southern Rhodesia, submitted to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The report stated that at the request of the Special Committee, the Secretary-General had transmitted to the President of the

3/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 23, chap. VI, annex III.

International Olympic Committee and the Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the XXth Olympic Games the text of the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 30 April in connexion with the IOC's attitude toward the National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia. The report added that on 29 May the Chairman of the International Olympic Committee had replied to the effect that the Secretary-General's letter would be referred to the IOC at its next meeting, that the IOC dealt only with national olympic committees and not with Governments, and that the National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia had been recognized for many years and, so far as was known, conformed to Olympic regulations.

102. During October 1971 the Committee was informed of press reports from Luxembourg where the International Olympic Committee had met in plenary session. It was reported that the IOC had accepted the formula which provided for the appearance of a Rhodesian team at the 1972 Games in Munich on the same conditions as previously, namely, that they should use the same flag, embodying a Union Jack, and the same anthem, "God Save The Queen". As for the passports to be used, the United Nations passport restriction presented no problem since the Olympic identity card would suffice for the purpose.

103. On 10 December 1971 the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Fourth Committee, adopted resolution 2796 (XXVI) on the question of Southern Rhodesia, which, referring among other things to the question of the Olympic Games, noted with deep regret the decision of the International Olympic Committee to permit the participation in the XXth Olympic Games of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia; it also called upon all States to take all appropriate steps to ensure the exclusion of the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia from participating in the XXth Olympic Games and requested the Secretary-General to draw the attention of the President of the International Olympic Committee to the relevant provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) for appropriate action.

104. In August 1972 the Committee received information published in the press to the effect that 40 members of the Rhodesian team for the Olympic Games in Munich had attended a farewell dinner in Salisbury on 9 August ^{4/} prior to their departure for Germany. According to this information, great importance was placed on Rhodesians making an appearance at Munich because it was felt that that would go a long way towards breaking the sporting boycott imposed on the country after its declaration of independence. It was recalled in that connexion that Rhodesia had competed last in the Tokyo Olympics in 1964, while the Mexican Government had cancelled the Rhodesians' visas for the 1968 Games after a threatened boycott of the Games by a number of States. The same article indicated that the President of the German Olympic Organizing Committee had told a delegation of African sports leaders on 9 August that the invitation to Rhodesia must stand, that the Rhodesians had already received their identity cards, and that the cards allowed the holders to enter the Federal Republic of Germany without passports.

105. At its 106th meeting on 18 August the Committee adopted the text of a note verbale which it requested the Secretary-General to address to the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany and decided that this text should also be issued as a United Nations press release.

^{4/} The Times, London, 10 August 1972.

The substantive part of this note verbale, which was delivered to the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany on 19 August, read as follows:

"... the Committee, at its 106th meeting held on 18 August 1972, examined the question of the participation of a team from Southern Rhodesia in the Olympic Games in Munich.

"Without prejudice to the opinions which have been expressed on the question of the very formation of this team the Committee considered that the entry into the Federal Republic of Germany of members of this team, whether or not they are bearers of "Olympic identity cards", provides the possibility of conflict with the provisions of paragraph 5 (b) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), as well as with those of paragraph 3 of the same resolution.

"Anxious to assist the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in its efforts to prevent any violation of sanctions the Committee draws the Government's attention to this point and requests it to draw the contents of this note to the attention of the International Olympic Committee and to remind this body that the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council on the sanctions include the activities of individuals, private organizations and Governments.

"The Committee would be grateful if the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would inform it, as soon as possible, of any actions taken by the Government, in response to this note and as appropriate, under the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, so as to ensure that no violations of the Security Council's resolutions on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia might occur. The Committee remains seized of the matter."

On 24 August, the Committee learned from published sources that the International Olympic Committee, at a meeting held in Munich on 22 August, had decided by a vote of 36 in favour, 31 against, and 3 abstentions, to withdraw its invitation to Southern Rhodesia to compete in the 1972 Olympic Games.

On 28 August, the Acting Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany informed this decision in a reply to the Secretary-General's note verbale of 24 August; the substantive part of the reply reads as follows:

"... The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has considered the Secretary-General's note as a valuable assistance in its endeavours to bring about a solution by the International Olympic Committee of the question of the participation of a team from Southern Rhodesia in the Olympic Games in Munich.

"In compliance with the suggestion of the Sanctions Committee the Federal Government transmitted the text of the Secretary-General's note to the International Olympic Committee which is alone responsible for the Olympic Games.

"The Federal Government has in its communications to the International Olympic Committee never left any room for doubt as to its respect for United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"On 22 August 1972, the International Olympic Committee decided to withdraw its invitation to the team of Southern Rhodesia to take part in the Olympic Games in Munich."

CHAPTER IV

AIRLINES OPERATING TO AND FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

109. Information brought to the attention of the Security Council in the fourth report (ibid., paras. 83 and 84) are still valid.
110. In particular, it appears from the time-table distributed by Air Rhodesia, effective 1 November 1972, that Air Rhodesia has direct flights to the following cities: Johannesburg and Durban (South Africa), Vilanculos and Beira (Mozambique) and Blantyre (Malawi).
111. According to the same time-table, connecting services exist between Salisbury (Southern Rhodesia) and Luanda (Angola) and Lourenço Marques (Mozambique). There is also a road connexion between the airports of Victoria Falls (Southern Rhodesia) and Livingstone (Zambia).
112. According to the same 1972 brochure, Air Rhodesia maintains offices in Beira, Lourenço Marques and Vilanculos (Mozambique), Blantyre (Malawi), Cape Town, Durban and Johannesburg (South Africa) and New York (United States of America).
113. It appears furthermore from the official Airlines Guide (International Edition, December 1972) and from the ABC World Airways Guide (December 1972) that airlines from Malawi, Portugal and South Africa have direct flights to Salisbury.

CHAPTER V

IMMIGRATION AND TOURISM

A. Immigration

114. In June 1971, according to Rhodesian Radio, the population of Southern Rhodesia reached the 5.5 million mark, made up as follows:

Africans	5,220,000
Europeans	249,000
Coloureds	9,300
Asians	16,900
	<hr/>
TOTAL	5,495,200
	<hr/> <hr/>

115. The annual population growth rate of nearly 3.5 per cent is among the world's highest. The greatest increases are among Africans, whose birth rate of 48 per 1,000 compares with a death rate of 14 per 1,000. The Family Planning Association of Rhodesia is actively engaged in family planning programmes for the African population, and reports a marked change in African attitudes towards family planning. 5/

116. At the official opening of the Spilhaus Family Planning Centre at the Harari African Hospital in 1970 the Mayor of Salisbury stated that the Rhodesian economy could absorb only half of the annual increase of 40,000 African adults entering the labour market, and thus Rhodesia must check its African population growth rate. 6/

117. The figures given in the third report of the Committee (S/9844/Rev.1, para. 52) indicated that for the period 1961 to 1964 Southern Rhodesia had experienced a net loss of 23,510 Europeans through emigration. During the period 1965-1969, however, the rebel régime reported a net immigration of 15,940 Europeans. More recent figures for the years 1970-1971 reflect a further rise in the net migration of Europeans into the country, as follows:

	<u>Immigrants</u>	<u>Emigrants</u>	<u>Net migration</u>
1970	12,345	6,018	6,327
1971	14,743	5,340	9,403

5/ Rhodesian Commentary, February 1970, p. 4 and Africa Research Bulletin, Vol. 8, No. 12, 31 January 1972, p. 2240.

6/ Rhodesian Commentary, July 1970, p. 2.

118. The Rhodesian Central Statistical Office has provided a description of the make-up of the 14,743 white European immigrants reported in 1971 that indicates that 61.5 per cent were under 30 years of age and 28.5 per cent were between 20 and 29 years old. For the same year it reported that 68 per cent of the emigrants were under 30 and 35.3 per cent were between 20 and 29 years of age. The net gain in all age groups has been rising steadily, particularly in the 20 to 29 age group. Gains were also reported during 1971 in a number of occupational categories, as follows:

	<u>Immigrants</u>	<u>Emigrants</u>	<u>Net migration</u>
Professional and technical	1,227	560	667
Managerial, administrative, clerical, sales, agricultural and production	2,431	478	1,953
Construction	644	61	583
Nurses and midwives	164	134	30

119. There are also indications that the number of Africans emigrating from Southern Rhodesia has increased. The proportion of Africans in the total population has not decreased, however, owing to the high birth rate of the Africans.

120. Immigration figures for the first months of 1972 were given in the publication, The Chronicle, of 8 June 1972. According to this report, there were 5,320 European, Asian and coloured immigrants to Southern Rhodesia for the first quarter of 1972, compared with a total of 4,869 for the same period in 1971.

121. Differing views have been expressed in Southern Rhodesia on the question of emigration. A report issued in October 1970 by the Joint Consultative Committee of the Salisbury Chamber of Commerce and Industry stated that emigration was due mainly to a lack of housing and transportation facilities, and added that 30 per cent of new immigrants were leaving the country. These statements were contested by the Minister of Information, Immigration and Tourism in an address to the Salisbury Chamber of Industries. ^{7/} He asserted that only 20 per cent of immigrants to Southern Rhodesia left the country within a year of their arrival, and that that figure contrasted favourably with those for Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. He stated that his Ministry's success in attracting immigrants was "nothing less than a miracle" in the face of existing difficulties, which he said included (a) a British Order in Council providing for heavy penalties for anyone promoting immigration to Southern Rhodesia; (b) the fact that immigration could not be disguised by "arranged certificates of origin" as products could be, and thus was more severely affected by sanctions; and (c) "misleading" reports in the world press. He maintained further that the great majority of the 480-500 people who left the country each month could not be termed dissatisfied immigrants, but were people who left owing to such exigencies as business transfers.

^{7/} Rhodesian Chronicle, November 1970, p. 2.

B. Tourism

122. In its fourth report to the Security Council, the Committee indicated that it had taken note of information according to which the "Rhodesia National Tourist Board" claimed to have offices in Salisbury, Johannesburg, Durban, Cape Town, Lourenço Marques, Basle and New York, and had requested the Secretary-General to seek further information on the matter from the Governments concerned.

123. In a note dated 20 May 1971, Switzerland replied to the Secretary-General's request for information, stating that an inquiry concerning the alleged office of the Rhodesia National Tourist Board at Basle, carried out by the competent Federal authorities, had shown that there was no tourism office in that city connected with an office of the Rhodesian Government.

124. At the 56th meeting of the Committee on 25 May, the Chairman stated, in connexion with the matter that the Committee had received information concerning the address and telephone number of the office in question and suggested that since those details had not originally been communicated to the Government of Switzerland, perhaps it would be useful to ask the Secretary-General to request further information. The Committee agreed with that suggestion, and accordingly the Secretary-General addressed a further note to the Permanent Observer of Switzerland.

125. The statistics for tourism in Southern Rhodesia given in the Committee's fourth report had shown a clear growth. During 1971, however, there appears to have been a slow-down in the expansion of Rhodesian tourism. The yearly growth rate of 11 per cent between 1966 and 1969 fell to 7 per cent in 1970, and the figures for the first half of 1971 showed an even smaller increase. The Minister of Information, Immigration and Tourism has given a number of reasons for the drop in the growth rate of tourism, including the fact that the country had to deal with "biased publicity".

126. Despite the régime's concerted effort to attract tourists from all over the world, it is apparent that most come from South Africa. Although there are no figures published as to the origin of tourists, the fact that 75 per cent arrive by road is indicative of the fact that South Africa and Mozambique are a major source. Rhodesian information sources recognize that the expansion of tourism depends on close co-operation with neighbouring territories, as package-tour operators in Europe, Japan and North America are unlikely to be interested in visits to Southern Rhodesia alone. Accordingly, as a long-range goal, the authorities hope for a political break-through which would enable Rhodesia to be linked in package-tour operations with neighbouring countries like Kenya. 8/

8/ Rhodesian Commentary, published by Rhodesian Ministry of Information, Immigration and Tourism, November 1971.

ANNEXES

Explanatory note

The first, 9/ second, 10/ third (S/9844/Rev.1, 11/ annex VII), and fourth (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, 12/ annex I) reports of the Committee to the Security Council contained texts of reports and substantive parts of correspondence with Governments on 114 cases concerning suspected violations of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

Annexes I to III to the fifth report contain additional information received by the Committee on 36 of the cases previously reported together with the texts of reports and substantive parts of correspondence with Governments received up to and including 22 December 1972, concerning 24 new cases brought to the Committee's attention since the submission of the fourth report.

List of all the cases

(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. MINERALS

Serial No. Case No.

Ferrochrome, chrome sand and chrome ores

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| (1) | 1 | Chrome sand - <u>Tjibodas</u> :
United Kingdom note dated 20 December 1968 |
| (2) | 3 | Chrome sand - <u>Tjipondok</u> :
United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1969 |
| (3) | 5 | Trade in chrome ore and ferrochrome:
United Kingdom note dated 6 February 1969 |

9/ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1968, document S/8954.

10/ Ibid., Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1969, document S/9252 and Add.1, annex XI.

11/ Ibid., Twenty-fifth Year, Special Supplement Nos. 3 and 3A.

12/ Ibid., Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement Nos. 2 and Corrigendum and 2A.

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(4)	6	Ferrochrome - <u>Blue Sky</u> : United Kingdom note dated 12 February 1969
(5)	7	Ferrochrome - <u>Catharina Oldendorff</u> : United Kingdom note dated 22 February 1969
(6)	11	Ferrochrome - <u>Al Mubarakiah</u> and <u>Al Sabahiah</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 April 1969
(7)	17	Ferrochrome - <u>Casikara</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 June 1969
(8)	23	Ferrochrome - <u>Massimoemee</u> and <u>Archon</u> : United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1969
(9)	25	Ferrochrome - <u>Batu</u> : United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969
(10)	31	Chrome ore and ferrochrome - <u>Ville de Nantes</u> : United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969
(11)	36	Ferrochrome - <u>Ioannis</u> : United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(12)	37	Ferrochrome - <u>Halleren</u> : United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(13)	40	Ferrochrome - <u>Ville de Reims</u> : United Kingdom note dated 29 August 1969
(14)	45	Ferrochrome - <u>Tai Sun</u> and <u>Kyotai Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 20 September 1969
(15)	55	Ferrochrome - <u>Gunvor</u> : United Kingdom note dated 10 November 1969
(16)	57	Chrome ore - <u>Myrtidiotissa</u> : United Kingdom note dated 17 November 1969
(17)	59	Shipments of ferrochrome to various countries: United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969
(18)	64	Chrome ore and ferrochrome - <u>Birte Oldendorff</u> : United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969
(19)	71	Ferrochrome - <u>Disa</u> : United Kingdom note dated 2 April 1970
(20)	73	Chrome ores - <u>Selene</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 April 1970

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(21)	74	Chrome ores and concentrates - <u>Castasegna</u> : United Kingdom note dated 17 April 1970
(22)	76	Ferrochrome - <u>Hodakasan Maru</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1970
(23)	77	Ferrochrome - <u>S.A. Statesman</u> : United Kingdom note dated 28 May 1970
(24)	79	Chrome ore - <u>Schutting</u> : United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1970
(25)	80	Chrome ore - <u>Klostertor</u> : United Kingdom note dated 10 June 1970
(26)	81	Ferrochrome - <u>Merrian</u> : United Kingdom note dated 17 June 1970
(27)	84	Chrome ores and concentrates - <u>Johns Stove</u> : United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1970
(28)	87	Ferrochrome - <u>Margaret Cord</u> : United Kingdom note dated 5 August 1970
(29)	89	Chrome ore - <u>Ville du Havre</u> : United Kingdom note dated 18 August 1970
(30)	95	Ferrochrome and ferrosilicon chrome - <u>Trautenfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 11 September 1970
(31)	100	Minerals - <u>Cuxhaven</u> : United Kingdom note dated 16 October 1970
(32)	103	Chrome ore - <u>Anna Presthus</u> : United Kingdom note dated 30 October 1970
(33)	108	Minerals - <u>Schonfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
(34)	110	Chrome ores - <u>Kybfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 January 1971
(35)	116	Minerals - <u>Rotenfels</u> : United Kingdom note dated 31 March 1971
(36)	135	Chrome ore - <u>Santos Vega</u> : Information submitted by Somalia on 20 March 1972
(37)	130	Chrome ore - <u>Agios Georgios</u> : Information submitted by Somalia on 27 March 1972

Serial No. Case No.

Tungsten ore

(38) 78 Tungsten ore - Tenko Maru and Suruga Maru:
United Kingdom note dated 28 May 1970

Copper

(39) 12 Copper concentrates - Tjipondok:
United Kingdom note dated 12 May 1969

(40) 15 Copper concentrates - Eizan Maru:
United Kingdom note dated 4 June 1969

(41) 34 Copper exports:
United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969

(42) 51 Copper concentrates - Straat Futami:
United Kingdom note dated 8 October 1969

(43) 99 Copper - various ships:
United Kingdom note dated 9 October 1970

Nickel

(44) 102 Nickel - Randfontein:
United Kingdom note dated 28 October 1970

(45) 109 Nickel - Sloterkerk:
United Kingdom note dated 11 January 1971

(46) 118 Nickel - Serooskerk:
United Kingdom note dated 6 May 1971

Lithium ores

(47) 20 Petalite - Sado Maru:
United Kingdom note dated 30 June 1969

(48) 21 Lithium ores:
United Kingdom notes dated 3 July and 27 August 1969

(49) 24 Petalite - Abbekerk:
United Kingdom note dated 12 July 1969

(50) 30 Petalite - Simonskerk:
United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1969

(51) 32 Petalite - Yang Tse:
United Kingdom note dated 6 August 1969

Serial No. Case No.

- (52) 46 Petalite - Kyotai Maru:
United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969
- (53) 54 Lepidolite - Ango:
United Kingdom note dated 24 October 1969
- (54) 86 Petalite ore - Krugerland:
United Kingdom note dated 4 August 1970
- (55) 107 Tantalite - Table Bay:
United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970

Pig-iron and steel billets

- (56) 29 Pig-iron - Mare Piceno:
United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1969
- (57) 70 Steel billets:
United Kingdom note dated 16 February 1970
- (58) 85 Steel billets - Despinan and Birooni:
United Kingdom note dated 30 July 1970
- (59) 114 Steel products - Gemini Exporter:
United Kingdom note dated 3 February 1971
- (60) 137 Steel billets - Malaysia Fortune:
United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972
- (61) 138 Steel billets - Aliakmon Pilot:
United Kingdom note dated 26 October 1972

Graphite

- (62) 38 Graphite - Kaapland:
United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
- (63) 43 Graphite - Tanga:
United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
- (64) 62 Graphite - Transvaal, Kaapland, Stellenbosch and Swellendam:
United Kingdom note dated 22 December 1969

B. TRADE IN TOBACCO

- (65) 4 Mokaria:
United Kingdom note dated 24 January 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(66)	10	<u>Mohasi:</u> United Kingdom note dated 29 March 1969
(67)	19	<u>Goodwill:</u> United Kingdom note dated 25 June 1969
(68)	26	Transactions in Southern Rhodesian tobacco: United Kingdom note dated 14 July 1969
(69)	35	<u>Montaigle:</u> United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1969
(70)	82	<u>Elias L.:</u> United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1970
(71)	92	Cigarettes believed to be manufactured in Rhodesia: United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970
(72)	98	<u>Hellenic Beach:</u> United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1970
(73)	104	<u>Agios Nicolaos:</u> United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970
(74)	105	<u>Montalto:</u> United Kingdom note dated 2 November 1970

C. TRADE IN MAIZE AND COTTON SEED

(75)	18	Trade in maize: United Kingdom note dated 20 June 1969
(76)	39	Maize - <u>Fraternity:</u> United Kingdom note dated 27 August 1969
(77)	44	Maize - <u>Galini:</u> United Kingdom note dated 18 September 1969
(78)	47	Maize - <u>Santa Alexandra:</u> United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969
(79)	49	Maize - <u>Zeno:</u> United Kingdom note dated 26 September 1969
(80)	53	Cotton seed - <u>Holly Trader:</u> United Kingdom note dated 23 October 1969
(81)	56	Maize - <u>Julia L.:</u> United Kingdom note dated 13 November 1969

Serial No. Case No.

- (82) 63 Maize - Polyxene C.:
United Kingdom note dated 24 December 1969
- (83) 90 Maize - Virgy:
United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970
- (84) 91 Maize - Master Daskalos:
United Kingdom note dated 19 August 1970
- (85) 96 Cotton - S.A. Statesman:
United Kingdom note dated 14 September 1970
- (86) 97 Maize - Lambros M. Fatsis:
United Kingdom note dated 30 September 1970
- (87) 106 Maize - Corviglia:
United Kingdom note dated 26 November 1970
- (88) 124 Maize - Armonia:
United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971
- (89) 125 Maize - Alexandros S.:
United Kingdom note dated 23 September 1971
- (90) 134 Maize - Bregaglia:
United Kingdom note dated 30 June 1972

D. TRADE IN WHEAT

- (91) 75 Supply of wheat to Southern Rhodesia

E. TRADE IN MEAT

- (92) 8 Meat - Kaapland:
United Kingdom note dated 10 March 1969
- (93) 13 Meat - Zuiderkerk:
United Kingdom note dated 13 May 1969
- (94) 14 Beef - Tabora:
United Kingdom note dated 3 June 1969
- (95) 16 Beef - Tugelaland:
United Kingdom note dated 16 June 1969
- (96) 22 Beef - Swellendam:
United Kingdom note dated 3 July 1969
- (97) 33 Meat - Taveta:
United Kingdom note dated 8 August 1969

<u>Serial No.</u>	<u>Case No.</u>	
(98)	42	Meat - <u>Polana</u> : United Kingdom note dated 17 September 1969
(99)	61	Chilled meat: United Kingdom note dated 8 December 1969
(100)	68	Pork - <u>Alcor</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970
(101)	117	Frozen meat - <u>Drymakos</u> : United Kingdom note dated 21 April 1971
F. TRADE IN SUGAR		
(102)	28	<u>Byzantine Monarch</u> : United Kingdom note dated 21 July 1969
(103)	60	<u>Filotis</u> : United Kingdom note dated 4 December 1969
(104)	65	<u>Eleni</u> : United Kingdom note dated 5 January 1970
(105)	72	<u>Lavrentios</u> : United Kingdom note dated 8 April 1970
(106)	83	<u>Angelia</u> : United Kingdom note dated 8 July 1970
(107)	94	<u>Philomila</u> : United Kingdom note dated 28 August 1970
(108)	112	<u>Evangelos M.</u> : United Kingdom note dated 22 January 1971
(109)	115	<u>Aegean Mariner</u> : United Kingdom note dated 19 March 1971
(110)	119	<u>Calli</u> : United Kingdom note dated 10 May 1971
(111)	122	<u>Netanya</u> : United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1971
(112)	126	<u>Netanya</u> : United Kingdom note dated 7 October 1971
(113)	128	<u>Netanya</u> : United Kingdom note dated 11 February 1972

Serial No. Case No.

(114) 131 Mariner:
United Kingdom note dated 12 April 1972

(115) 132 Primrose:
United Kingdom note dated 26 April 1972

G. TRADE IN FERTILIZERS AND AMMONIA

(116) 2 Import of manufactured fertilizers from Europe:
United Kingdom note dated 14 January 1969

(117) 48 Ammonia - Butaneuve:
United Kingdom note dated 24 September 1969

(118) 52 Bulk ammonia:
United Kingdom notes dated 15 October and
10 November 1969

(119) 66 Ammonia - Cérons:
United Kingdom note dated 7 January 1970

(120) 69 Ammonia - Mariotte:
United Kingdom note dated 13 February 1970

(121) 101 Anhydrous ammonia:
United States note dated 12 October 1970

(122) 113 Anhydrous ammonia - Cypress and Isfonn:
United Kingdom note dated 29 January 1971

(123) 123 Anhydrous ammonia - Znon:
United Kingdom note dated 30 August 1971

(124) 129 Anhydrous ammonia - Kristian Birkeland:
United Kingdom note dated 24 February 1972

H. MOTOR VEHICLES

(125) 9 Motor vehicles:
United States note dated 28 March 1969

I. CYCLE ACCESSORIES

(126) 88 Cycle accessories:
United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1970

Serial No. Case No.

J. TRACTOR KITS

(127) 50 Tractor kits:
United Kingdom note dated 2 October 1969

K. AIRCRAFT

(128) 41 Aircraft spares:
United Kingdom note dated 5 September 1969

(129) 67 Supply of aircraft to Southern Rhodesia:
United Kingdom note dated 21 January 1970

L. DIESEL ELECTRIC LOCOMOTIVES

(130) 111 Traction equipment for diesel electric locomotives:
United Kingdom note dated 15 January 1971

M. BOOK-KEEPING AND ACCOUNTING MACHINES

(131) 58 Book-keeping and accounting machines:
Italian note dated 6 November 1969

N. SHIRTS

(132) 93 Shirts manufactured in Southern Rhodesia:
United Kingdom note dated 21 August 1970

O. OTHER CASES

(133) 27 Memorandum on the application of sanctions:
Note by the Secretary-General dated 18 September 1969

(134) 120 Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games:
Note from the Federal Republic of Germany dated
5 April 1971

(135) 121 Documentation required for exports from and imports
into Mozambique:
United Kingdom note dated 17 June 1971

(136) 127 The Eastern Trading Company (Pty) Ltd., Swaziland:
United Kingdom note dated 28 October 1971

(137) 133 Supply of medical equipment to the University of
Southern Rhodesia:
Swedish letter dated 7 June 1972

(138) 136 Import of sculptural objects from Southern Rhodesia:
Swedish letter dated 25 October 1972

ANNEX I

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

This annex contains information received by the Committee in two specific cases concerning the import of chrome, nickel and other materials from Southern Rhodesia into the United States and the texts of the substantive parts of correspondence with Governments relating to those cases, as well as the substantive texts of the quarterly reports submitted to the Committee by the United States, up to and including 22 December 1972.

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

At the 67th meeting held on 20 March 1972, the representative of Somalia drew the attention of the Committee to information from various sources, according to which a shipment of chrome ore of Southern Rhodesian origin was en route to a United States port on a ship flying the Argentine flag, the Santos Vega, and owned by a Norwegian concern.

A statement was made by the representative of Argentina at the meeting, pointing out the difficulty for Governments to investigate an alleged evasion of sanctions without first receiving an official communication from the Committee giving the details of the case. He stated that no such communications had as yet been received by his Government. However, he informed the Committee of the action so far taken by his Government concerning the case in question (S/10580, para. 5).

At the 68th meeting on 22 March, the representative of the United States, on instructions from his Government, informed the Committee that the Santos Vega had on 20 March begun off-loading at Burnside, Louisiana, 27,902 tons of Rhodesian chrome ore imported under the terms of the Byrd Amendment. He was not in a position to state whether there would be further shipments of chrome ore to the United States; however, his Government was prepared to report on any future shipments on a quarterly basis.

At that meeting the Committee decided to submit an interim report, drawing the special attention of the Security Council to the matter.

At the 103rd meeting held on 29 June 1972, the representative of Argentina made a statement concerning the measures taken by his Government in connexion with the shipment of Rhodesian chrome ore aboard the Santos Vega. The Committee decided to issue on the same day the statement of the representative of Argentina as an addendum (S/10580/Add.1) to its interim report to the Security Council.

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

At the 70th meeting held on 27 March 1972, the representative of Somalia drew the attention of the Committee to information from various sources according to which a Greek freighter, the Agios Georgios, was reported to have loaded in the port of Beira, Mozambique, some 26,400 tons of chrome ore suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin and destined for the United States. It was further reported that the vessel listed in Lloyd's Registry, is owned by Evimeria, C. I. A. Nou (Greece).

At the request of the Committee at that meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 4 April to Greece inquiring whether the Greek Government might be in a position to provide any information regarding the cargo in question.

At the 76th meeting of the Committee held on 6 April, the representative of the United States informed the Committee that the Agios Georgios had arrived at New Orleans, United States, on 4 April 1972 and unloaded 29,682 tons of Rhodesian chrome ore on that date. Following that statement, the Committee decided to submit an interim report, drawing the special attention of the Security Council to the matter.

At the request of the Committee at that meeting, the Secretary-General sent another note verbale dated 11 April asking the Greek Government to investigate the circumstances in which a cargo of Rhodesian origin was carried on a Greek vessel in violation of the provisions of paragraph 3 (c) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), and also inquiring what action the Greek Government had taken or proposed to take in connexion with the Committee's request contained in the Secretary-General's earlier note verbale of 4 April.

Meanwhile, a reply dated 11 April 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 state the following.

"In accordance with the Security Council resolution 232 (1966) adopted on 16 December 1966, Greece has hastened to take additional measures with a view to ensuring the full implementation of this resolution.

"As this Permanent Mission has informed you by its note No. 5095 of 11 November 1967, reproduced in document S/8243 of 14 November 1967 appropriate legislation had been enacted (law 95, published in the Government Gazette of 11 August 1967) complementing previous decrees and Government decisions aimed at the prohibition of transactions between Greece and the Salisbury régime.

"Article 1, paragraph 4, of law 95 provides that:

"The transportation with ships under Greek flag or Greek airships of any of the products referred to under paragraph 1 hereof originating from Southern Rhodesia and exported therefrom after 16 December 1966 is forbidden."

"By its note No. 3068 dated 24 July 1968 this Permanent Mission has informed the Secretary-General that in conformity with Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, the Government of Greece enacted new legislation (law 540, published in the Government Gazette of 15 September 1968) extending the previous ban on trade relations with Southern Rhodesia to include all commodities and products without exception.

"As a result of these measures, trade between Greece and Southern Rhodesia is non-existent as appears from the quarterly reports submitted unremittingly by Greece to the Secretary-General. Neither has there been any established case of a Greek ship transporting merchandise of Rhodesian origin, despite the fact that the Greek mercantile fleet ranks amongst the largest in the world.

"The Greek competent authorities will not fail to carry out proper and thorough investigations concerning the case of the freighter Agios Georgios referred to in your note of 4 April 1972. Should these investigations reveal that the provisions of the aforesaid Greek legislation have been violated, the penalties provided for will be imposed and penal prosecution exercised.

"It would be very much appreciated if the contents of this note were communicated to the members of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

A reminder was sent to Greece on 13 June 1972.

A reply dated 19 June 1972 has been received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations has the honour, in awaiting the final report with respect to the investigation of this case, to inform him (the Secretary-General) that the preliminary examinations have been carried out by the competent Greek authorities.

"In this connexion Esperos Shipping Co., the owners of the said vessel, stated to the Greek authorities that they ignored the origin of the consignment Agios Georgios had to transport to the United States, as the Charter Party, signed in New York, 18 January 1972, indicated that the cargo of chrome ore would be loaded in Capetown or Beira in Charterer's option. A photostatic copy of the above-mentioned Charter Party is attached hereto.

"The above-mentioned case has been already duly transmitted to the Chief's Office of Port Police in order to proceed with the necessary measures for penal and disciplinary action against the responsible thereon, according to law 95/67."

A further reply dated 6 July has been received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations has the honour to state the following with regard to the measures promptly taken by Greece in order to ensure full implementation of the Security Council resolution imposing sanctions on Southern Rhodesia.

"As this Permanent Mission has informed you by its note of 11 November 1967 appropriate legislation was enacted (law 95, published in the Government Gazette of 11 August 1967), complementing previous decrees and government decisions aimed at the prohibition of transactions between Greece and the Salisbury régime.

"Article 1, paragraph 4, of law 95 provides that:

"The transportation with ships under Greek flag or Greek airships of any of the products referred to under paragraph 1 hereof originating from Southern Rhodesia and exported therefrom after 16 December 1966 is forbidden'.

"By its note dated 24 July 1968, this Permanent Mission has informed the Secretary-General that, in conformity with Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, the Government of Greece enacted new legislation (law 540, published in the Government Gazette of 15 September 1968), extending the previous ban on trade relations with Southern Rhodesia to include all commodities and products without exception.

"As a result of these measures, trade between Greece and Southern Rhodesia is non-existent, as appears from the quarterly reports submitted unremittingly by Greece to the Secretary-General. Neither has there been in the past any established case of a Greek ship transporting merchandise of Rhodesian origin, despite the fact that the Greek mercantile fleet ranks amongst the largest in the world.

"The competent Greek authorities will not fail to carry out proper and thorough investigations concerning cases of probably violations. And should such investigations reveal that the provisions of the aforesaid Greek legislation have been violated, the penalties provided for will be imposed and penal prosecution exercised.

"It would be very much appreciated if the contents of this note were circulated as an addendum to document S/10593, dated 10 April 1972."

Quarterly reports submitted to the Committee by the United States

A communication dated 10 July 1972 addressed to the Chairman of the Committee has been received from 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 April to 30 June. Attached please find a list of these imports.

"In addition, I wish to recall that at the 81st meeting of the Committee, held on 17 April, the United States representative reported on indictments that had been handed down by a United States Grand Jury against four individuals and two corporations accused of violating the United Nations

United States imports of strategic materials from Southern Rhodesia during the period 1 April to 30 June 1972 not previously reported to the Sanctions Committee

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Port of export</u>	<u>Port of import</u>	<u>Date of arrival</u>	<u>Vessel</u>
Nickel cathodes	189 tons	Beira	Baltimore	10/4/72	SS African Sun
Nickel cathodes	177 tons	Beira	Baltimore	29/4/72	SS Moormacove
Nickel cathodes	25 tons	Durban	Baltimore	15/5/72	SS Hellenic Leader
High carbon ferrochromium	548 tons	Lourenço Marques	San Francisco	23/5/72	SS Bris
Nickel cathodes	130 tons	Beira	Baltimore	17/6/72	SS Moormacargo
Nickel cathodes	10 tons	Beira	Los Angeles	20/6/72	SS Marne-Lloyd

sanctions against Rhodesia. I wish to inform the Committee that, as a result of these indictments, the parties concerned pleaded guilty and that the Margas Company and the IDI Management, Inc., of Cincinnati were fined \$100,000 and \$25,000 respectively. Mr. Herbert H. Hamilton, President of IDI Management, Inc., was fined \$7,500, received a suspended sentence and was placed on probation for a year. Mr. David J. Patterson, a businessman included in the indictment, was fined \$2,500 and Mr. Conrad E. Wysocki, an engineer with IDI Management, Inc., drew a \$1,750 fine. Finally, Mr. Edward H. Bartlett, a lawyer and certified public accountant, was fined \$10,000 and given a one-year suspended sentence and placed on probation for four years.

"As you will recall, the indictment handed down by the Grand Jury resulted from efforts by the above-mentioned individuals to build a \$50 million chemical fertilizer plant in Rhodesia and to enter into a secret agreement with the Rhodesian régime to ship \$5 million worth of ammonia to Rhodesia."

A letter dated 11 October addressed to the Chairman of the Committee has been received from 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 during the period 1 July to 1 October. Attached please find a list of these imports."

United States imports of strategic materials from Southern Rhodesia during the period 1 July to 1 October 1972

<u>Vessel</u>	<u>Date of Arrival</u>	<u>Port of import</u>	<u>Port of export</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
M/V Aktion (not previously reported)	6/8/72	Burnside, La.	Lourenço Marques	Low carbon ferrochrome	551 tons
M/V Pholegandros	7/3/72	Burnside, La.	Lourenço Marques	Ferrochrome silicon	2,205 tons
SS African Sun	7/8/72-	Charleston, S.C.	Beira	Asbestos fibres	160 tons
	7/26/72	Baltimore, Md. New York Philadelphia, Pa.	Lourenço Marques	Nickel cathodes Ferrochrome Beryllium ore	42 tons 700 tons 27 tons
M/V North Highness	7/19/72- 7/30/72	Baltimore, Md. New York	Lourenço Marques	Ferrochrome Ferrochrome silicon	509 tons 1,118 tons
M/V Angelo Scinicarello	7/23/72	Burnside, La.	Beira	Ferrochrome	28,164 tons
SS Musi Lloyd	7/24/72	New York	Beira	Nickel cathodes	5 tons
SS S.A. Huguenot	8/14/72	New Orleans, La.	Lourenço Marques	High carbon Ferrochrome	1,101 tons
SS Merwe Lloyd	8/21/72	Los Angeles, Calif.	Beira	Nickel cathodes	42 tons
M/V Mexican Gulf	8/29/72	New Orleans, La. Burnside, La.	Lourenço Marques	Ferrochrome Low carbon ferrochrome	4,187 tons 1,100 tons
SS African Moon	9/1/72	Baltimore, Md.	Beira	Nickel cathodes	214.6 tons
SS African Lightning	9/6/72	Baltimore, Md.	Beira	Nickel cathodes	86 tons
SS La Chacra	9/13/72	Detroit, Mich.	Lourenço Marques	Ferrochrome silicon	550 tons
SS Mormacery	9/15/72	Baltimore, Md.	Lourenço Marques	Nickel cathodes	42 tons

ANNEX II

CASES CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS REPORTS AND NEW CASES

Specific cases concerning suspected violations

A. MINERALS

Ferrochrome, chrome sand and chrome ore

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from the Netherlands and Czechoslovakia, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

- (1) Note verbale dated 8 April 1971 from the Netherlands

"The Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations wishes to recall that it has already, in the annex to his note dated 2 April 1970 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VII, serial No. 11, para. 5) by way of exception sent data regarding the dates and ways of transit of the above-mentioned consignment to the Secretary-General for the attention of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"In these circumstances the Permanent Representative assumes that no further action on his part is required.

"The Permanent Representative also wishes to recall the understanding that this information has been supplied on a confidential basis and is not for publication.

"The Permanent Representative finally wishes to refer to the note of the Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations dated 13 January 1971 (see S/10229/Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial No. 11, para. 3) concerning this matter, from which it follows that the Government of the Federal Republic subsequently made successful enquiries into this question."

- (2) Note verbale dated 9 February 1972 from Czechoslovakia

"The Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations... has the honour to communicate the position of his Government concerning the data included in Security Council document S/10229/Add.1 of 16 June 1971.

"The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has already declared on many occasions that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has always consistently fulfilled and will fulfil all provisions of Security

Council resolution 253 (1968) in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations. For example, the Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations had the honour to assure the Secretary-General of the United Nations about it in his note of 3 February 1969 (see S/8786/Add.6, annex) and also, inter alia, in his notes of 30 April 1970 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VII, serial No. 16, para. 10) and of 2 July 1970 (see S/10229/Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial No. 16, para. 4) by which he reacted to the note of the United Kingdom of 17 November 1969. The results of the investigation undertaken by the respective Czechoslovak authorities with the aim of clarifying the content of the information included in the note of the Federal Republic of Germany of 13 January 1971 clearly proved again that no Czechoslovak trade organization had violated the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). At the same time, it became evident that approximately at the time, to which the information contained in the note of the Federal Republic of Germany referred, Czechoslovak trade organizations purchased chrome ore of Iranian origin from a Swiss company - RIF Trading Co. Ltd., Zurich.

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and does not maintain with it either diplomatic, commercial or any other relations, which the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic has had the honour to communicate repeatedly in its preceding responses to the notes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

At the Committee's request, following consideration of the case at its 109th and 112th meetings, the Secretary-General sent a note dated 10 October 1972 to all the Governments concerned, namely: Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Norway, asking for further information in view of the communication above from Czechoslovakia.

An acknowledgement dated 30 October 1972 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

A reminder was sent to Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Norway on 8 December 1972.

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

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

- (12) Case No. 37 Ferrochrome - "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 Ferrochrome - "Ville de Reims": United Kingdom note dated 29 August 1969

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 7 April 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, 13/ the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Netherlands Government has already passed on information regarding the consignments together with details on the dates and modes of transit through the Netherlands directly to the Governments of countries to which the cargoes in question were shipped.

"The Permanent Representative would be prepared to forward the above-mentioned information, which is at his disposal, to the Secretary-General, if he would be kind enough to confirm that this information which is of a confidential nature, would be for the exclusive use of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

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

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

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 7 April 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 13 above.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

13/ The same reply also covers the following cases below:

- (15) Case 55 Ferrochrome - "Gunvor"
- (24) Case 79 Ferrochrome - "Schutting"
- (25) Case 80 Chrome ore - "Klostertor"
- (29) Case 89 Minerals - "Ville du Havre"
- (30) Case 95 Ferrochrome and Ferrosilicon chrome - "Trautenfels".

A reply dated 7 June 1971 has been received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations... has the honour to forward attached herewith copy of Statement of Facts, issued on 17 December 1969 by the Agenzia Marittima Finanziaria, Trieste, showing that the cargo in question totalled 13,662 long tons which is the equivalent of 13,577,184 kilograms (13,577 metric tons)."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 19 July 1971 to Austria bringing to the attention of the Austrian Government the information concerning the cargo in question submitted to the Committee by Italy (see S/10229/Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial No. 16, para. 4) and Greece (see above), and requesting it to carry out further investigations with a view to clearing the apparent disparities in the replies submitted by all three Governments.

A reminder was sent to Austria on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 28 December 1971 has been received from the Austrian Government, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... Investigations carried out by the Austrian authorities have shown that the 'Veitscher Magnesit Werke A.G.' purchased 7,117 tons of chrome ore from the shipment in question. For this amount, the following four certificates of origin established by the Chamber of Commerce of Johannesburg have already been transmitted:

1.	Certificate for the amount of:	744 tons
2.	" " " " " "	2,467 "
3.	" " " " " "	1,568 "
4.	" " " " " "	2,338 "
		<hr/>
		7,117 tons."
		<hr/>

A reminder was sent to Panama on 1 June 1972.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from Sweden and the Netherlands, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 23 March 1971 from Sweden

"... the investigation of the matter undertaken by the competent Swedish authorities has so far not yielded any relevant information. Certain aspects of the matter are, however, still being pursued by the authorities and further information will be transmitted to the Secretary-General upon completion of the investigation."

(2) Note verbale dated 8 April 1971 from the Netherlands

"... the m.v. Disa berthed at Rotterdam on 31 March 1970 carrying amongst others shipments of siliconchrome, ferrochrome and ferrochrome ore. The shipments were declared for transit to the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and Norway.

"The Netherlands authorities conducted the customary thorough investigation into the origin of the aforesaid cargo. Permit for transit was granted after the inquiry had yielded no evidence whatsoever of the shipments originating in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Netherlands Government has forwarded supplementary information concerning the date and way of transit of the consignments through the Netherlands after their unloading, together with the identity of the consignees directly to the Governments of the countries to which the cargoes were shipped.

"The Permanent Representative, furthermore, wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Disa has not berthed at Amsterdam.

"The Permanent Representative would be prepared to forward the above-mentioned complementary data to the Secretary-General, if he would be kind enough to confirm that this information, which is of a confidential nature, would be for the exclusive use of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 19 July 1971 to Norway and Sweden, the Netherlands having indicated in its note dated 8 April 1971 that the shipments were declared for transit to the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and Norway. No note verbale was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany as it had answered in a note dated 27 August 1970 that no cargo had been unloaded at its ports (see S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial No. 19, para. 3).

A reply dated 18 October 1971 has been received from Sweden, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... the competent Swedish authorities have not yet terminated their investigations. The delay in the investigation has been caused by difficulties in obtaining certain information from foreign sources."

A reminder was sent to Norway on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 4 February 1972 has been received from Norway, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"On instructions from his Government, the Permanent Representative has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the Norwegian authorities have undertaken a thorough investigation into the matter. This investigation has confirmed that there is no reason to suspect that any violation of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council has occurred in connexion with the importation of the said consignment of ferrochrome into Norway. The relevant documents (invoice and declaration of origin) have been duly submitted by the Norwegian importer, and show beyond any doubt that the consignment is of South African origin."

At the Committee's request at its 72nd meeting the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 6 April 1972 to Sweden and Norway asking the Swedish authorities if they had now completed their investigation, and further requesting Norway to submit the documentation provided to the Norwegian investigating authorities.

A reply dated 6 June 1972 has been received from Sweden, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations... has the honour to inform him [the Secretary-General] that the Swedish authorities have not yet concluded the investigations in the case concerning the vessel Disa.

"The Acting Permanent Representative will not fail to forward the results of the investigation to the Secretary-General upon the completion of the investigation."

A reminder was sent to Norway on 28 June 1972.

A reply dated 12 July 1972 has been received from the Government of Norway enclosing copies of the invoice and the declaration of origin submitted by the Norwegian importer.

A reply dated 21 July 1972 has been received from Sweden, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The investigations of the Swedish authorities pertaining to the case regarding the vessel Disa and its consignment of ferrochrome, suspected to be of Rhodesian origin, have now been terminated. According to the Chief Public Prosecutor of Sweden the investigations have not led to other results than that the ferrochrome in question originates from the Republic of South Africa."

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

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

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

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

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

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

(23) Case No. 77 Ferrochrome - "S.A. Statesman": United Kingdom note dated 28 May 1970

The Committee decided that no further action was necessary on this case and that it should therefore be considered closed.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 7 April 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 13 above.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 7 April 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 13 above.

(26) Case No. 81 Ferrochrome - "Merian": United Kingdom note dated 17 June 1970

Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fourth report. The Committee had decided at its 72nd meeting that no further action was necessary on this case, which should thereby be considered as closed. However, additional information has been received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report and is given below.

A reply dated 27 April 1971 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... according to a thorough investigation by the German authorities, the vessel was under charter to a Brazilian enterprise at the time in question. The shipowners, Komrowski Befrachtungskontor KG, maintain that they have repeatedly pointed out to the charterer that merchandise of Southern Rhodesian origin may not be carried on the vessel. A clause providing for the employment of the vessel in the carrying of lawful merchandise only has been incorporated into the charter contract. The shipowners, however, are not in a position to control the observance of this clause, as the cargo is acquired by the charterer and his agents exclusively."

A reply dated 26 July 1971 has been received from Brazil, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Deputy Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations emphasizes the desire of the Brazilian Government to co-operate with the Government of the United Kingdom in avoiding any recurrence of difficulties such as those involved in the case of the Merian voyage of May 1970, by strict observance of the requirement of a certificate of origin, as outlined in... the note verbale of 30 September 1970" (Ibid., serial No. 17, para. 4).

(27) Case No. 84 Chrome ores and concentrates - "Johs Stove": United Kingdom note dated 23 July 1970

Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fourth report. The Committee had decided at its 72nd meeting that no further action was necessary on this case, which should thereby be considered as closed. However, additional information has been received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report and is given below.

A reply dated 26 July 1971 has been received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... investigations carried out by the competent Austrian authorities have shown that, as the certificate of origin clearly indicates, this shipment originated from the Republic of South Africa and not from Southern Rhodesia. Since the shipment dates back a considerable time ago, all the material has already been processed so that a chemical analysis of the ores can unfortunately not be effected."

(28) Case No. 87 Ferrochrome - "Margaret Cord": United Kingdom note dated 5 August 1970

The Committee decided that no further action was necessary on this case, which should be considered closed.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 7 April 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 13 above.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 7 April 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 13 above.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 10 March 1971 from the Netherlands

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations... with reference to the Secretary-General's notes verbales of 23 November 1970 and 29 January 1971 concerning consignments of minerals on the vessel Cuxhaven, has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that no cargo was unloaded from the vessel during her call at the port of Rotterdam on 22 October 1970."

(2) Note verbale dated 11 June 1971 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations... with reference to the Secretary-General's notes verbales of 23 November 1970 and 29 January 1971 has the honour to communicate the following.

"According to information received from the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs in Bonn the M.S. Cuxhaven called at the port of Hamburg on 11 October 1970 to unload one automobile and a consignment of about 40 tons of scrap iron which had been taken aboard at Ras el Khaima on the Persian Gulf. An unspecified cargo of ore taken aboard at Lourenço Marques seems to have been unloaded at Rotterdam some time between 6 and 10 October 1970. At the time, the Cuxhaven was under charter to the Deutsche Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft Hansa. Under the charter agreement the shipper was not permitted to accept cargo not originating in the South African Republic.

"In its note of 10 March 1971 addressed to the Secretary-General the Netherlands Government stated that no cargo was unloaded from the vessel Cuxhaven at Rotterdam on 22 October 1970. This is indeed the case since by that time the Cuxhaven was outward-bound again to Red Sea ports.

"In view of the foregoing it seems indicated to address another inquiry to the Netherlands Government to receive confirmation that the M.S. Cuxhaven also called at Rotterdam between 6 and 10 October 1970 and to establish whether or not the ore was unloaded in that port during these days."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 19 July 1971 asking the Government of the Netherlands to confirm whether the cargo aboard the Cuxhaven was not in fact unloaded at Rotterdam between 6 and 10 October, rather than on 22 October 1970 as previously reported.

A reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 8 February 1972 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... Further enquiries by the Netherlands authorities into this matter have shown that shipments of chrome ore, silicon chrome ore, ferrochrome and nickel cathodes destined for the Federal Republic of Germany and for Spain have indeed been unloaded from the Cuxhaven during its stay in the port of Rotterdam on 7 October 1970.

"The Ministries of Foreign Affairs of these countries will be informed by the Netherlands Government about the destination of the goods and the modes of transport after their unloading in Rotterdam.

"The Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the investigation conducted by the Netherlands customs officers yielded no evidence of any irregularity.

"Consequently, no objection was made to the transfer of the cargo through the Netherlands.

"The Permanent Representative would be prepared to forward this supplementary information concerning the consignees and the modes of transport to the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) if the Secretary-General would be kind enough to confirm that this information would be used on a strictly confidential basis."

At the Committee's request at its 110th meeting the Secretary-General sent a note dated 10 October 1972 to the Federal Republic of Germany and Spain, asking for further information.

An acknowledgement dated 30 October 1972 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

A reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany and Spain on 8 December 1972.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

At its 43rd meeting, on 18 March 1971, the Committee decided to request the Secretary-General to seek further information concerning this case from the Governments of Austria and Yugoslavia. On 22 March, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale to Yugoslavia, as well as an automatic reminder to Czechoslovakia. However, no note was sent to Austria because on that same day a reply concerning this matter was received from that Government, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of Austria to the United Nations... has the honour to refer to his the Secretary-General's note of 9 December 1970 concerning a cargo of some 15,000 tons of chrome ore believed to be of Rhodesian origin aboard the vessel Anna Presthus, which sailed from Lourenço Marques on 10 October 1970 for Trieste.

"The Acting Permanent Representative of Austria has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that, in the light of the relevant investigations undertaken by the competent Austrian authorities the chrome ore loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the m.v. Anna Presthus was intended for the Veitscher Magnesitwerke A.G., Vienna 1., Schubertring 10-12. The Swiss firm 'RIF Trading Company' acted as agent as had been mentioned in the note of the United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations to the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"According to the Veitscher Magnesitwerke A.G., the port authorities at Trieste had 'raised difficulties' when the ore was unloaded since it was suspected to be of Rhodesian origin. However, these difficulties were settled without delay because the certificate of origin clearly proved that the chrome ore originated from the Republic of South Africa."

Replies have been received from Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 16 April 1971 from Yugoslavia

"The Permanent Representative of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the United Nations... has the honour to inform that instructions have been issued to port authorities not to permit vessel Anna Presthus to dock at any Yugoslav ports."

(2) Note verbale dated 9 February 1972 from Czechoslovakia

"... The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has already declared on many occasions that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has always consistently fulfilled and will fulfil all provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Permanent Representative of

the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations has the honour to assure the Secretary-General about it, for example, in his note of 3 February 1969 (see S/8786/Add.6, annex) and also, inter alia, in his notes of 30 April 1970 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VII, serial no. 16, para. 10) and of 2 July 1970 (see S/10229 and Add. 1 and 2, annex I, serial no. 16, para. 4) by which he reacted to the note of the United Kingdom of 17 November 1969 about alleged deliveries of chrome ore of Southern Rhodesian origin to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The results of the investigation undertaken by the respective Czechoslovak authorities in connexion with the note of the United Kingdom of 30 October 1970 clearly proved again that no Czechoslovak trade organization had violated the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). At the same time, it was clarified that at approximately the time, to which the information contained in the note of the United Kingdom of 30 October 1970 referred, Czechoslovak trade organizations purchased chrome ore of Iranian origin from a Swiss firm - RIF Trading Co., Ltd., Zurich.

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and does not maintain with it either diplomatic, or commercial or any other relations, which the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had the honour to communicate repeatedly in its preceding responses to the notes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

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

By a note dated 26 November 1970 (ibid., serial no. 33, para. 1) the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning consignments of minerals on the above vessel.

At the request of the Committee, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 15 December 1970 to the Federal Republic of Germany, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 5 April 1971.

A reply dated 21 May 1971 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... The shipowners, Deutsche Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft Hansa Bremen, have declared that the cargo was shipped for account of Spedimex Speditionsgesellschaft m.b.H. of Düsseldorf-Herrdt (Federal Republic of Germany). Under paragraph 38 of the charter contract the charterer was permitted only to load cargo originating in the Republic of South Africa. The cargo was unloaded in Rotterdam on 26 November 1970."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 19 July 1971 to the Netherlands informing it of the reply from the Federal Republic of Germany in order to help it ascertain the precise origin of the cargo.

A reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 8 February 1972 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... The Schonfels berthed at the port of Rotterdam on 26 November 1970 carrying amongst others consignments of nickel cathodes, chrome ore, ferrochrome ore and ferrosilicon chrome ore.

"The consignments were declared for transfer to the Federal Republic of Germany and with regard to part of the nickel cathodes for transfer to Belgium.

"Permit for transfer was granted after the customary enquiry by the Netherlands authorities into the origin of the goods had yielded no evidence of any irregularity.

"The cargo was transferred between 26 and 30 November 1970 by boat and by truck.

"In order to facilitate further enquiries as requested by the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the Netherlands Government forwarded information regarding the names of the consignees and modes of transport of the cargo after its unloading in Rotterdam directly to the authorities concerned in Bonn and Brussels.

"The Permanent Representative would be prepared to pass on this supplementary information to the Secretary-General as well as to the above-mentioned Committee, if he would be kind enough to confirm that this information would be used on a strictly confidential basis."

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 7 June 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The m.v. Kybfels berthed at Rotterdam on 10 January 1971, carrying amongst others consignments of chrome ore and ferro chrome. The shipments were declared for transit to Austria and France.

"The Netherlands authorities made the customary enquiry into the origin of the shipments in question. Permit for transit was granted after the investigation had yielded no evidence of the shipments originating in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Acting Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Netherlands Government has already forwarded

information regarding the dates of arrival and transit and modes of transit through the Netherlands as well as the identity of the consignee directly to the Governments of France and Austria.

"The Acting Permanent Representative would be prepared to pass on this supplementary information to the Secretary-General, if he would be kind enough to confirm that this information which is of a confidential nature, would be for the exclusive use of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

At its 60th meeting on 6 July 1971, the Committee decided to request the Secretary-General to inform Austria of the contents of the Netherlands note.

A reply dated 29 June 1971 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"According to the Deutsche Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft Hansa, Bremen, the shipment of chrome ores and concentrates was carried out for the account of Spedimex Speditionsgesellschaft m.b.H., Düsseldorf. Clause 38 of the charter agreement stipulated that the company was to transport only cargo which had originated in the Republic of South Africa. According to the shipping documents, the cargo met this condition.

"On January 12, 1971, the freight was transshipped in Rotterdam to other vessels and railroad cars and forwarded, between 14 and 29 January 1971, to the following destinations;

"Ferrochrome to Böhler and Co., in Kapfenburg and to
Steirische Gusswerke in Judenburg (Austria)

"Chrome ores to Soci  t   Ugine Kuhlman in Mortiers and to
Sogema S.A. in Strasbourg (France)."

The reply from the Federal Republic of Germany was communicated to all the members of the Committee on 16 July 1971 with a suggestion by the Secretariat that the Committee might also wish to refer to the contents of that reply in the note to be sent to Austria, as decided at the 60th meeting. No objection was received from any member of the Committee; consequently, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale to Austria on 19 July 1971, as indicated above.

A reminder was sent to Austria on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 28 December 1971 has been received from Austria, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... Investigations carried out by the competent Austrian authorities have shown that the shipments of chrome ore on board the Kybfels were discharged at Rotterdam and purchased by 'Boehler and Co., Kapfenberg' and 'Steirische Gusstahlwerke', Judenburg. The certificates of origin established by the Chamber of Commerce of Johannesburg indicate that the chrome ore in question is of South African origin."

(35) Case No. 116 Minerals - "Rotenfels": United Kingdom note dated 31 March 1971

By a note dated 31 March 1971 the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning the sales of large consignments of minerals on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has recently received information from commercial sources, which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation, concerning the sales of further large consignments of minerals suspected to have been mined in Southern Rhodesia. The information is to the effect that several thousands of tons of minerals (mainly various grades of chrome ores and concentrates) were loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the Deutsche Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft Hansa motor vessel Rotenfels, for carriage to Rotterdam. This vessel, which is registered in the Federal Republic of Germany, cleared Lourenço Marques on 15 March and should arrive in Rotterdam about 10 April.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany so as to enable them to investigate the origin and final destination of all minerals loaded aboard this vessel at Lourenço Marques for carriage to Europe on her present voyage."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 7 April 1971 to the Governments of the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

An acknowledgement dated 11 May 1971 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

A reply dated 1 July 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and with reference to the latter's note of 7 April 1971 concerning the sales of several thousand tons of minerals suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin and loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the Deutsche Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft Hansa motor vessel Rotenfels has the honour to inform the Secretary-General as follows.

"The m.v. Rotenfels arrived at Rotterdam on 10 April 1971 carrying amongst other things a shipment of ferrochrome, ferro siliconchrome and chrome ore grade 3. The shipment was declared for transit to the Federal Republic of Germany and Sweden.

"Complementary information pertaining to the date and mode of transit through the Netherlands of the consignment in question have already been forwarded directly to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and Sweden.

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands would be prepared to send this supplementary information to the Secretary-General if he would be kind enough to confirm that this information, which is of a confidential nature, would be for the exclusive use of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 19 July 1971 to Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany drawing their attention to the contents of the above note from the Netherlands.

A reply dated 24 August 1971 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations... concerning the sales of several thousand tons of minerals loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the motor vessel Rotenfels of the Deutsche Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft Hansa has the honour to inform the Secretary-General as follows:

"The Rotenfels which arrived at Rotterdam on 10 April 1971 was carrying amongst other things a shipment of ferrochrome, ferro siliconchrome and chrome ore grade 3. The shipment was declared for transit to the Federal Republic of Germany and Sweden.

"It was verified that in accordance with the provisions of the charter party and as was certified by the charterers, Fa. Spedimex Speditionsgesellschaft m.b.H., Düsseldorf, the cargo loaded at Lourenço Marques originated from the Republic of South Africa."

At the Committee's request at its 75th meeting, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 11 April 1972 to the Federal Republic of Germany and to Sweden asking for information.

An acknowledgement dated 25 April 1972 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

A reminder was sent to Sweden and to the Federal Republic of Germany on 1 June 1972.

Replies have been received from Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 6 June 1972 from Sweden

"The Acting Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations... has the honour to inform him [the Secretary-General] as follows: a renewed examination by the Swedish authorities of the documentation pertaining to the shipment in question has produced no evidence that the goods should have originated from Southern Rhodesia."

(2) Note verbale dated 14 June 1972 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations... concerning a consignment of minerals suspected to be of

Southern Rhodesian origin on the vessel Rotenfels has the honour to inform the Secretary-General as follows:

"Additional investigations by the German authorities with the firms destinators of part of the shipment of ferrochrome aboard the motor vessel Rotenfels have yielded no evidence of any irregularity. A careful inquiry of the documents covering the consignment did not show any evidence of the shipment originating in Southern Rhodesia. About 1,000 to 1,100 tons of ferrosiliconchrome have been shipped from Rotterdam directly to Scandinavia. About 80 tons of ferrosiliconchrome had been destined for transshipment through Germany to Austria."

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

See annex I.

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

See annex I.

Tungsten ore

(38) 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

(39) 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.

(40) 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.

(41) 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.

(42) 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.

(43) 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

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 8 April 1971 from the Netherlands

"The m.v. Randfontein called at the port of Rotterdam on 22 October 1970 carrying amongst other things 286 barrels of nickel, which cargo was declared for transit to Spain and Italy. The permit for transit was granted after the Netherlands custom officers had established that the consignment in question was not from Southern Rhodesian origin.

"Complementary data concerning the consignment, together with information with respect to the dates and ways of transit through the Netherlands after its unloading, were sent directly to the Governments of Spain and Italy.

"The Permanent Representative would be prepared to forward the above-mentioned supplementary data to the Secretary-General if he would be kind enough to confirm that this information, which is of a confidential nature, would be for the exclusive use of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

(2) Note verbale dated 12 May 1971 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that no nickel was unloaded from the vessel during its calls at the ports of Hamburg and Bremen."

A reminder was sent to Spain on 2 November 1971.

A second reminder was sent to Spain on 5 June 1972.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 9 July 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the quantity of barrels containing nickel was unloaded from the vessel after its arrival at the port of Rotterdam on 12 January 1971.

"The carriage in question was shipped to destinations in Spain, Greece, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and Austria.

"A careful inquiry by the Netherlands authorities of the documents covering the consignment did not show any evidence of the shipment originating in Southern Rhodesia.

"The Acting Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Netherlands Government has already forwarded complementary information pertaining to the modes of transit through the Netherlands as well as to the consignees directly to the Governments of countries to which the cargo in question was shipped.

"The Acting Permanent Representative would be prepared to pass on the aforesaid supplementary information, which is at his disposal, to the Secretary-General, if he would be kind enough to confirm that this information which is of a confidential nature, would be for the exclusive use of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

At the Committee's request at its 73rd meeting, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 2 May 1972 to Austria, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy and Spain, in view of the reply above from the Netherlands.

An acknowledgment dated 10 May 1972 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany.

Replies have been received from Austria, Belgium, Greece, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 8 May 1972 from Italy

"The Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Italy to the United Nations... has the honour... to assure him /the Secretary-General/ that the contents of the note have been brought to the attention of the competent authorities in Italy. The information that will be gathered by the said authorities will be transmitted as soon as possible.

"In the meantime it is to be noted that the case of the mv. Sloterkerk was brought to the attention of the Committee on sanctions by the United Kingdom in a note dated 11 January 1971. The contents of the note were not communicated to Italy since no information was available at that time

that part of the shipment of the m.v. Sloterkerk was destined to Italy. The Government of the Netherlands gave certain information about the above-said shipment in a note to the Secretary-General dated 9 July 1971 which was circulated among the members of the Committee on sanctions on 11 November 1971. No action was taken by the Committee at that time. The Committee's decision referred to in the Secretary-General's note of 2 May to ask further information to a number of States, among which Italy, has been taken by the Committee in April 1972.

"It will be readily realized that the very long delay by which this case has been brought to the attention of the interested Governments by the Committee raises a number of serious difficulties for the investigating authorities."

(2) Note verbale dated 10 May 1972 from Greece

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations... has the honour to inform him /the Secretary-General/ that the inquiries carried out by the Greek Authorities have proved that the consignment of nickel imported from Rotterdam was not of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"Photostatic copies of the documents submitted by the importers to the Greek Authorities are attached thereto."

(3) Note verbale dated 14 June 1972 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"The Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations... concerning a consignment of nickel suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin on the vessel Sloterkerk, has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that investigations by the German authorities after contacting the Netherlands authorities did not show any evidence of the shipment originating in Southern Rhodesia. A careful inquiry of the documents covering the suspected consignment did not show any irregularity."

(4) Note verbale dated 31 July 1972 from Belgium

"The Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations... has the honour to refer to the note of the Secretary-General dated 3 May 1972...

"On instructions from his Government, the Permanent Representative has the honour to confirm, for the information of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), that part of a cargo of nickel shipped aboard the vessel Sloterkerk, was actually re-shipped to Belgium as stated by the Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in its note to the Secretary-General dated 9 July 1971.

"The Belgian authorities do not, however, see any need to proceed with the further investigation requested by the Committee in view of the fact that the examination of the shipping documents made by the Netherlands authorities did not provide any evidence that the cargo in question is of Rhodesian origin.

"It should be noted in that connexion that under the rules of the customs union formed by the three Benelux countries, it is the importing country which levies the customs duties and controls the origin of the goods, even if that country is not the country of final destination of the goods.

"In this case, the cargo in question, to the extent that it was, in part, destined for Belgium, was controlled upon its entry into the Netherlands in the same way as it would have been if the importation had been made directly by Belgium.

"In the circumstances, the Belgian authorities consider that the only information they have to communicate to the Secretary-General is that supplied by the Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in the note referred to earlier."

(5) Note verbale dated 5 August 1972 from Austria

"The Permanent Representative of Austria to the United Nations... with reference to the Secretary-General's notes of 6 April and 2 May 1972, has the honour to inform him that the investigations of the competent Austrian authorities concerning a consignment of nickel unloaded from the m.v. Sloterkerk at the port of Rotterdam on 12 January 1971, part of which had been shipped to a destination in Austria, have not brought forward any evidence that the consignment in question originated in Southern Rhodesia. Similarly, the port authorities of Rotterdam could not find any indication of the suspected nickel consignment originating in Southern Rhodesia.

"Moreover, it may be pointed out that, due to the fact that the shipment in question took place almost 18 months ago, investigations were lengthy and any evidence difficult to establish."

A further reply dated 11 September 1972 has been received from Italy, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of Italy to the United Nations... has the honour to inform him /the Secretary-General/ that the enquiry carried out so far by the competent Italian authorities has established that no part of a consignment of nickel unloaded from the m.v. Sloterkerk in Rotterdam on 12 January, 1971, has reached Italy."

A reminder was sent to Spain on 13 September 1972.

A second reminder was sent to Spain on 7 December 1972.

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

By a note dated 6 May 1971 the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a consignment of nickel on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has recently received information from commercial sources which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation, about the shipment of further consignments of nickel suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that consignments of this mineral were recently loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the m.v. Serooskerk for carriage to Rotterdam. This vessel, which is of Netherlands registration, cleared Lourenço Marques on 15 April for Hamburg via intermediate ports and is provisionally scheduled to arrive in Rotterdam about 15 May.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the attention of the Government of the Netherlands with a view to assisting them in their investigations into the origin of any nickel unloaded from this vessel at Rotterdam on her present voyage either for local use or for transshipment to other countries."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 11 May 1971 to the Netherlands.

A reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 8 February 1972 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... The Serooskerk arrived in Rotterdam on 16 May 1971 carrying amongst other things a shipment of nickel. Part of the cargo (respectively 5 and 32 packages) was declared for transit to Switzerland and Spain after its unloading at Rotterdam.

"The largest part of the cargo was stored in the customs warehouse for a while. In the meantime 22 packages of that stock have also been passed to transit to Switzerland.

"In view of the fact that the customary investigation by the Netherlands authorities did not produce evidence of any irregularity whatsoever, no objection was made against transit of the goods through the Netherlands.

"The rest of the cargo was imported into the Netherlands. Permission for import was granted by the customs officers on the basis of a certificate of origin, pertaining to the cargo and issued by the 'Chamber of Industries of Transvaal'.

"At the request of the Netherlands Government the Embassy of South Africa in The Hague has legalized the signature figuring on that certificate and has declared 'that the contents can be accepted as true and correct'.

"Information relating to the consignees and modes of transit of the consignments has been passed on directly to the authorities in Bern and Madrid.

"The Permanent Representative would be prepared to forward this supplementary information to the Secretary-General, which then could also be made available to the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), if the Secretary-General would be kind enough to confirm that this information will be used on a strictly confidential basis."

At the Committee's request at its 113th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note dated 10 October 1972 to Spain and Switzerland, drawing their attention to the information given by the Netherlands.

A reply dated 7 December 1972 has been received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Part of the consignment was reportedly destined for Switzerland.

"The competent Swiss authorities have investigated this matter and have ascertained that Switzerland did not import any nickel of Southern Rhodesian origin during 1971. As to the above-mentioned consignment, the Netherlands authorities have presumably, in the meantime confirmed to the Secretary-General that it did not involve nickel of Southern Rhodesian origin."

A reminder was sent to Spain on 8 December 1972.

Lithium ores

(47) 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.

(48) Case No. 21 Lithium ores: United Kingdom notes dated 3 July and 27 August 1969

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from Pakistan and the Netherlands, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 9 March 1971 from Pakistan

"The Permanent Representative of Pakistan... with reference to the Secretary-General's note dated 14 September 1970 has the honour to inform that the Government of Pakistan has already notified through its Import Policy (January-June 1971) Order, paragraph 13, that no import will be allowed from South Africa and Rhodesia or of Rhodesian origin from any country."

(2) Note verbale dated 8 June 1971 from the Netherlands

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands... with reference to the Secretary-General's note of 14 September 1970

concerning the origin of lithium ores in southern Africa, has the honour to state the following.

"The contents of the note of the United Kingdom Mission of 27 July 1970, as well as the annex thereto have retained the full attention of the Netherlands Government.

"In certain cases Netherlands geological and mineralogical experts who were consulted by the Netherlands Government do not contest the feasibility of determining the geological age of ores on the basis of the analysis process of the Institute of Geological Sciences of London.

"At the same time, however, Netherlands experts are of the opinion that the means devised by the London Institute, as described in the annex of the aforesaid note of the United Kingdom Mission, does not yield conclusive evidence as to the exact origin of lithium ores."

An acknowledgement dated 5 April 1971 has been received from Nauru.

(49) 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.

(50) 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.

(51) 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.

(52) 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.

(53) 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.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 8 June 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the cargo in question was intended for a customer in the Netherlands.

"With regard to the documents covering the consignment and submitted by the importer, the Acting Permanent Representative would recall the earlier note of the Permanent Representative of 30 November 1970. In this note the Permanent Representative informed the Secretary-General that, in conducting the investigation, the Netherlands authorities took into account the suggestions contained in the Secretary-General's note of 18 September 1969 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VI), concerning additional evidence with regard to the origin of goods.

"Accordingly, in the case in question, a certificate of origin was produced, a railway note of the South Africa railways as well as a copy of the contract between the importer and his suppliers which barred delivery of any petalite originating in Southern Rhodesia."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 19 July 1971 to the Netherlands requesting it to submit to the Committee a photocopy of the bill of lading for the cargo in question.

A reminder was sent to the Netherlands on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 8 February 1972 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... As a result of the death of Mr. J. de Poorter the importer of the petalite in question, the document submitted by him which served to identify its origin and mentioned in the Permanent Representative's note of 8 June 1971, No. 1377 are not anymore at the disposal of the Netherlands authorities.

"There are, however, indications that the management of his company has been taken over by the Sibelco Inc. in Antwerp, Belgium."

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

By a note dated 26 November 1970 (see S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial no. 51) the United Kingdom Government reported information about a consignment on Rhodesian tantalite on the above vessel.

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 15 December 1970 to the Federal Republic of Germany transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reminder was sent to the Federal Republic of Germany on 5 April 1971.

A reply dated 24 May 1971 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany which reads as follows:

"... The m.v. Table Bay unloaded 1368 kgs of tantalite in Bremen on 8 and 9 December 1970. The vendor, according to the invoice, was Hochmetals Africa (Pty) Ltd., Johannesburg. The merchandise was declared to be of South African origin. Neither the documents presented to the customs authorities nor the ship's manifesto gave any indication that the merchandise was of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The m.v. Table Bay is not of German registration. She is owned by South Africa Lines, Capetown."

Pig-iron and steel billets

(56) 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.

(57) 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.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A second reminder was sent to Iran and Liberia on 1 June.

A second reminder was sent to Panama on 5 June 1972.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reminder was sent to Greece, Iran and Panama on 15 September 1971.

A second reminder was sent to Greece and Iran on 1 June 1972.

A second reminder was sent to Panama on 5 June 1972.

A reply dated 7 July 1972 has been received from Panama, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 108 below.

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

By a note dated 26 October 1972 the United Kingdom Government reported information about a consignment of steel billets on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wishes to inform the Committee that it has received information which leads it to believe that a consignment of steel billets shipped to Aqaba was of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that between 20 June and 4 July the SS Malaysia Fortune was at the port of Lourenço Marques where she loaded a consignment of steel billets. The vessel proceeded from Lourenço Marques to the port of Aqaba in Jordan arriving on 20 July. The SS Malaysia Fortune is owned by the Malaysia Marine Corporation, Monrovia, and is registered in Liberia.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in order to assist it in its investigations into the origin of any steel billets unloaded from the SS Malaysia Fortune. Should the importers or the shipping company claim that the steel billets are not of Southern Rhodesian origin the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to the suggestion relating to documentary proof of origin contained in his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 and to request to Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the steel billets were of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the attention of the Government of Liberia so as to assist it in any investigations which it may wish to make into the carriage aboard the Liberian owned and registered vessel of steel billets suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 6 November 1972 to Jordan and Liberia, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

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

By a note dated 26 October 1972 the United Kingdom Government reported information about a shipment of steel billets on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wishes to inform the Committee that it has received information which leads it to believe that a consignment of steel billets shipped to Abadan was of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that the m.v. Aliakmon Pilot sailed from the port of Lourenço Marques on 26 June declared for Abadan having loaded a shipment of steel billets. The vessel proceeded from Lourenço Marques to the port of Abadan in Iran arriving on 21 July. The m.v. Aliakmon Pilot is owned by Aliakmon Marine Enterprises Corporation, Monrovia, and is registered in Greece.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Iran in order to assist it in its investigations into the origin of any steel billets unloaded from m.v. Aliakmon Pilot. Should the importers or the shipping company claim that the steel billets are not of Southern Rhodesian origin the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 and to request the Government of Iran to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the steel billets were of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the attention of the Governments of Liberia and Greece so as to assist them in any investigations which they may wish to make into the carriage aboard the Liberian owned and Greek registered vessel of steel billets suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 8 November 1972 to Liberia, Iran and Greece, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

Graphite

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

See annex III.

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

See annex III.

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

See annex III.

B. TRADE IN TOBACCO

(65) Case No. 4 "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.

(66) Case No. 10 "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.

(67) Case No. 19 "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.

(68) Case No. 26 Transactions in Southern Rhodesian 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.

(69) Case No. 35 "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.

(70) Case No. 82 "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.

(71) 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.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 25 October 1971 has been received from the Arab Republic of Egypt, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... concerning a consignment of tobacco suspected to be of Rhodesian origin, loaded at Beira for shipment to certain Mediterranean ports including Piraeus and Trieste for possible transshipment to Alexandria aboard S.S. Hellenic Beach owned by Hellenic Lines Limited of Piraeus, and sailing from Beira on 24 August 1970, the Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt has the honour to bring to the knowledge of the Secretary-General that the competent authorities in Cairo advised that the above-mentioned consignment is from Zambia and Malawi origin. The documentary proof of origin will be forwarded as soon as the Mission of Egypt receives it from Cairo.

"The Arab Republic of Egypt would appreciate if a correction be brought to document S/10229/Add.1 serial No. 66, in a new addendum document including the reply of the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt."

A further reply dated 24 January 1972 has been received from the Arab Republic of Egypt enclosing copies of two certificates of origin. The substantive part of the reply reads as follows:

"... with reference to its note dated 25 October 1971 concerning a consignment of tobacco suspected to be of Rhodesian origin, loaded at Beira for shipment to certain Mediterranean ports including Piraeus and Trieste for possible transshipment to Alexandria aboard S.S. Hellenic Beach as mentioned in the note of the United Kingdom Mission attached to the note of the Secretary-General dated 23 November 1970, the Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt has the honour to enclose herewith the documentary proof of origin, certificate Nos. 387 and 3215.

"The Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt would appreciate if a correction be brought to document S/10229/Add.1, serial No. 66, in a new addendum document including a reference to the above-mentioned certificates of origin."

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from Denmark and Panama, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 26 August 1971 from Denmark

"... the Danish authorities have investigated the matter with the Danish shipping company which has declared that it had originally examined the certificates of origin and had also obtained the charterer's guarantee that the cargo was not of Southern Rhodesian origin. From the enclosed photo copies of the 18 certificates of origin, made out on 14 August 1970 by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Beira, it appears that the tobacco originates from Mozambique. The Danish authorities have therefore found no reason for taking further steps in the matter. A copy of addendum No. 1 to the Charter Party of 12 August 1970 and copies of 18 bills of lading on the transportation of the cargo from Lourenço Marques are enclosed. The Permanent Mission would appreciate return of all the documents in due course."

(2) Note verbale dated 5 April 1972 from Panama^{14/}

"The Permanent Representative of the Republic of Panama to the United Nations... has the honour to inform him /the Secretary-General/ that the Government of the Republic of Panama, desiring to comply with the various Security Council resolutions relating to sanctions against Rhodesia has recently taken the following steps:

"1. The Ministry of the Interior and Justice, by note 112-DL of 10 February 1972 (copy enclosed) has reiterated Panama's interest in implementing the sanctions against Rhodesia.

"2. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by note DOI 1006 of 6 March 1972 transmitted the declaration in which my country reiterated its support for the sanctions ordered by the United Nations against the Rhodesian Government.

"3. Panama, after taking cognizance of the Secretariat notes verbales drawing attention to the cases referred to below, has now ordered a more thorough investigation of the companies said to be involved in these affairs in order to ascertain whether liability has been incurred.

"4. The Permanent Representative of Panama wishes to state that his Government will make a closer study of possible liability incurred by these Panamanian companies in accordance with Security Council resolution 253 (1968) although it holds that 'according to international agreements vessels of Greek registration even if owned by Panamanian companies must for all purposes be regarded as territory of the other country'" (note DOI-1767 of 9 March 1971 of the Panamanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

At the Committee's request at its 73rd meeting, the Secretary-General sent a further note verbale dated 6 April 1972 to Denmark based on certain suggestions made by members of the Committee.

At the same meeting the representative of Panama stated that his Government was still investigating the extent, if any, of the involvement in the case of the Panamanian company owning the vessel.

A reminder was sent to Denmark on 1 June 1972.

A reminder was sent to Panama on 14 June 1972.

A reply dated 29 September 1972 has been received from Denmark, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations... has the honour, according to instructions, to inform him /the Secretary-General/

14/ The same reply also covers the following cases below:

- (108) Case No. 112 Sugar - "Evangelos M"
- (101) Case No. 117 Meat - "Drymakos"
- (88) Case No. 124 Maize - "Armonia"
- (89) Case No. 125 Maize - "Alexandros S".

that the Danish Government has taken note of the contents of the Secretary-General's note of 6 April 1972 concerning a consignment of tobacco, suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, shipped on board the vessel Agios Nicolaos, chartered by the Danish shipping company A. H. Basse.

"Investigations have shown that the arrangement with regard to issuance of "Boletim de Registro Previo" certificates was not introduced till the autumn of 1971 in connexion with the import and export restrictions in respect of the Portuguese territories in Africa.

"Regrettably it has not been possible to produce further documentary evidence in the matter in addition to the copious material that has already been submitted. In these circumstances the Danish authorities regret to be unable to take any further action in the matter."

A second reminder was sent to Panama on 7 December 1972.

(74) Case No. 105 "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.

C. TRADE IN MAIZE AND COTTON SEED

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 22 March 1971 has been received from Canada to the Secretary-General's note verbale of 26 January 1971, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative also has the honour to refer to his interim reply of 4 February 1971 to the Secretary-General's note, in which it was stated that the Secretary-General's note, together with its attachment, was being brought to the attention of the appropriate Canadian authorities. These authorities have confirmed that according to the latest statistics available, no maize was imported into Canada from Mozambique during the first 11 months of 1970. Statistics are not yet available for the period subsequent to November 1970, but in so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce of the Canadian Government is aware, Canada imports maize only from the United States of America."

(76) 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 third report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(81) 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 third report.

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

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

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reminder was sent to Cyprus on 15 September 1971.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A second reminder was sent to Costa Rica on 5 June 1972.

(85) 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.

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

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

(87) 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.

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

1. By a note dated 30 August 1971, the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a shipment of maize on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has received information from commercial sources, which they consider to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation, to the effect that between 1 and 8 August at the port of Beira the motor vessel Armonia loaded several thousand tons of maize suspected to be of Rhodesian origin. The m.v. Armonia, registered in Greece and owned by Compania Armonia de Navigacion S.A. of Panama, is at present en route to the port of Puerto Cabello, Venezuela, where it is expected to arrive about 10 September.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Venezuela with a view to assisting it in its investigations into the origin of all maize loaded at Beira aboard the m.v. Armonia during her present voyage either for use in Venezuela or for transshipment. As it is possible that the importers of the maize may claim that it is produce of Mozambique, the Government of the United Kingdom further suggests that the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General to remind the Government of Venezuela of the Secretary-General's note of 18 September 1969 relating to documentary evidence of origin. The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to suggest to the Government of Venezuela that they require the production of the "Boletim de Registro" (exchange control certificates) together with the export authorization and certificate of origin issued by the Mozambique Cereals Institute.

"In the unlikely event of South African origin being claimed (because the export tenders of the Mealie Industry Control Board of Pretoria scheduled delivery only at the ports of Cape Town and Durban during the period 1 June to 28 August) the Committee may further wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Government of Venezuela that an export inspection certificate certifying the origin of the maize should be available.

"At the same time it is suggested that the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General to notify the Governments of Greece and Panama of the above report so as to assist them in their inquiries concerning the carriage aboard vessels of their registration or owned by companies established in their territory, of maize suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 7 September 1971 to Greece, Panama and Venezuela.

A reply dated 11 October 1971 has been received from Venezuela, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In that connexion, I am pleased to inform you /the Secretary-General/ that, in accordance with your notification, the Government of Venezuela undertook a careful investigation into the origin of the maize, and was able to establish from the certificate of 18 June 1971 issued by the Chamber of Commerce of Beira and from bill of lading No. 1 of 7 August 1971, which were authenticated by the Greek Consulate, in the absence of consular representation of Venezuela in Beira, that the cargo of maize originated in Mozambique.

"I also wish to take this opportunity to confirm that although my Government does not maintain commercial relations with Southern Rhodesia it published the measures adopted by the Security Council in its resolution 253 (1968) in the Gaceta Oficial de Venezuela No. 28713 of 27 August 1968 with a view to ensuring their implementation.

"Finally, I am pleased to inform you that my Government will reiterate to the relevant bodies the instructions to prevent any action which might hinder the effective implementation of the measures adopted by the Security Council."

At the Committee's request at its 76th meeting the Secretary-General sent reminders dated 11 and 13 April 1972 to Greece and Panama respectively, as well as a note to Venezuela dated 13 April 1972 along the lines suggested by the representatives of France and Somalia.

Replies have been received from Panama and Greece, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 5 April 1972 from Panama

See serial no. 73 above.

(2) Note verbale dated 24 April 1972 from Greece

"The Permanent Mission to Greece to the United Nations... has the honour to inform him /the Secretary-General/ that the owner of m.v. Armonia submitted to the competent Greek authorities certificate of origin, photostatic copy of which is enclosed hereto, showing that the cargo in question was of Mozambique origin.

"The Greek Authorities would very much appreciate it if the results of the investigation carried out by the authorities of the country of destination were communicated to them in order to complete their own inquiries."

A second reminder was sent to Panama and Venezuela on 5 June 1972.

At the Committee's request at its 103rd meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 5 July 1972 to Greece drawing attention to the information contained in Portuguese statistics that Portugal had exported no maize at all during the period January-October 1971, and seeking further validity of the documents submitted by the Greek Government in particular inquiring if the importers had produced the Boletim de Registro as recommended in the original United Kingdom note.

A reply dated 7 July has been received from Panama, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 108 below.

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

By a note dated 23 September 1971 the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a consignment of maize on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom, further to its note of 30 August 1971, about a consignment of maize on the m.v. Armonia wishes to inform the Committee that it has now received information from commercial sources, which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation, about a second consignment of maize destined for the Republic of Venezuela. The information is to the effect that between 23 and 28 August at the port of Beira, the m.v. Alexandros S loaded several thousand tons of maize suspected to be of Rhodesian origin. The m.v. Alexandros S, registered in Greece, and owned by Messrs. Helios Shipping Company SA of Panama, is at present en route to Puerto Cabello, Venezuela, where she is expected to arrive about 20 September.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Venezuela with a view to assisting it in its investigations into the origin of all maize loaded at Beira aboard the m.v. Alexandros S during her present voyage either for use in Venezuela or for transshipment. As it is possible that the importers of the maize may claim that it is produce of Mozambique, the Government of the United Kingdom further suggests that the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General to remind the Government of Venezuela of the Secretary-General's note of 18 September 1969 relating to documentary evidence of origin. The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to suggest to the Government of Venezuela that they require the production of the "Boletim de Registro" (exchange control certificate) together with the export authorization and certificate of origin issued by the Mozambique Cereals Institute.

"In the unlikely event of South African origin being claimed (because the export tenders of the Mealie Industry Control Board of Pretoria scheduled delivery only at the ports of Cape Town and Durban during the period 1 June to

28 August) the Committee may further wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Government of Venezuela that an export inspection certificate certifying the origin of the maize should be available.

"At the same time it is suggested that the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General to notify the Governments of Greece and Panama of the above report so as to assist them in their inquiries concerning the carriage aboard a vessel of their registration, or owned by a company established in their territory, of maize suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 29 September 1971 to Greece, Panama and Venezuela transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

Replies have been received from Greece, Venezuela and Panama, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 8 December 1971 from Greece

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations... has the honour to forward attached hereto photostatic copy of a certificate of origin showing that the shipment loaded on board the m.v. Alexandros S at the port of Beira last August was of Mozambique origin."

(2) Note verbale dated 20 January 1972 from Venezuela

"I have the honour of acknowledging receipt of your note dated 29 September 1971, enclosing the note submitted by the United Kingdom to the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) relating to a second shipment of maize presumed to be of Rhodesian origin which was loaded on board the Greek registered Panamanian vessel Alexandros S at Beira between 23 and 28 August and which is due to arrive at Puerto Cabello, Venezuela around 20 September.

"In this connexion, I am pleased to inform you that as in the case mentioned in my note dated 11 October last (see serial No. 88, above) and in the light of your communication the Government of Venezuela conducted a careful investigation into the provenance of this matter. On the basis of bill of lading No. 1 and the certificate issued by the Beira Commercial Association dated 26 July and 30 August 1971 respectively and authenticated in the Consulate of Greece since there is no Venezuelan Consulate at Beira it established that the shipment of maize originated in Mozambique."

(3) Note verbale dated 5 April 1972 from Panama
(See serial No. 73 above)

A reminder was sent to Panama on 14 June 1972.

At the Committee's request at its 102nd meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 21 June 1972 to Venezuela requesting production of the "Boletin de Registro", together with the export authorization and certificate of origin issued by the Mozambique Cereals Institute; and also drawing attention to the fact that, according to FAO statistics for Mozambique, there had been no exports of maize during the period January-October 1971.

A reply dated 7 July 1972 has been received from Panama, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 108 below.

(90) Case No. 134 Maize - "Bregaglia": United Kingdom note dated 30 June 1972

By a note dated 30 June 1972 the United Kingdom Government reported information about a consignment of maize on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has received information from commercial sources which it considers sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation concerning the shipment of a consignment of maize suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that between 14 and 23 May the SS Bregaglia was at the port of Beira where she loaded a consignment of several thousand tons of maize. The vessel proceeded from Beira to the port of Alexandria in the Arab Republic of Egypt arriving on 17 June. The SS Bregaglia is owned by the Suisse Atlantique Societé d'Armement Maritime SA of Lausanne and is registered in Switzerland.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt in order to assist it in its investigations into the origin of any maize unloaded from the SS Bregaglia. Should the importers or the shipping company claim that the maize is not of Southern Rhodesian origin the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 and to request the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the maize was of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the attention of the Government of Switzerland so as to assist it in any investigation which it may wish to make into the carriage aboard the Swiss-owned and registered vessel of maize suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 10 July 1972 to the Arab Republic of Egypt and Switzerland, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

Replies have been received from Switzerland and the Arab Republic of Egypt, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 15 August 1972 from Switzerland

"The Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations... has the honour to refer to the note of the Secretary-General concerning a load of maize suspected of being of Southern Rhodesian origin which was shipped from Mozambique aboard the cargo vessel Bregaglia, whose owner is Swiss and which is registered in Switzerland.

"This case was brought to the attention of the competent Swiss authorities, who received the following information from the owner of the vessel.

"The charter party concluded on 14 April 1972 with the General Organization for Supply of Goods, Cairo, contained the clause: 'No cargo of Rhodesian origin to be loaded'. Moreover, a certificate of origin presented to the Captain of the vessel Bregaglia and issued by the Agricola Exportadora Lda, Beira, read as follows:

'We hereby declare that the 17,881,600 kilos of maize shipped per the Bregaglia under Bill of Lading No. 1 dated 23 May 1972 are supplied by us and that this maize is of Mozambique origin.

'Furthermore, this parcel of African white maize is covered by documentary credit No. 24/76381, opened by the Egyptian International Bank for Foreign Trade and Development, Cairo.'

"Consequently, the owner of the vessel had no reason to doubt that the cargo was authentically of Mozambique origin, all the more as the General Organization for Supply of Goods, Cairo, and the Egyptian International Bank for Foreign Trade and Development are State enterprises."

(2) Note verbale dated 11 September 1972 from the Arab Republic of Egypt

"The Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations ... has the honour to inform him [the Secretary-General] that the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, upon receipt of the note, conducted a thorough investigation concerning the consignment of maize that was loaded at the port of Beira, Mozambique, and delivered in Alexandria.

"It was discovered that a company operating in Egypt had erroneously imported the consignment, in ignorance of its real source. Consequently, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt confiscated the aforementioned consignment. Furthermore, in the spirit of African solidarity, it decided to donate the amount equivalent to the consignment to the OAU Co-ordinating Committee for the liberation of Africa."

D. TRADE IN WHEAT

(91) Case No. 75 Supply of wheat to Southern Rhodesia

See annex III.

E. TRADE IN MEAT

(92) 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.

(93) 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.

(94) 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.

(95) 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.

(96) 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.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from the Federal Republic of Germany and France, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 14 April 1971 from France

"When the meats presumed to be of Rhodesian origin were unloaded from the Taveta (and Polana) no fraudulent intent was discovered in the declarations made by the forwarding agents. At that time they were not obliged to furnish a certificate of origin for goods in international transit to Switzerland. As usual, the information provided mentioned only the place where the goods had come from, i.e. the country of embarkation. The 70 metric tons of frozen meats transported by the Taveta had been embarked in South Africa and the 50 metric tons of ox tongues and livers had been loaded on the Polana in a Mozambique port.

"It has not been possible to obtain further information on the operation effected by the Taveta and Polana, since the vessels are German and the documents accompanying the goods which they were transporting have been delivered to the Swiss consignee. As the latter have recognized the Rhodesian origin of the goods, the French control services consider the matter closed.

"It should be added that following the requests for an inquiry made by the United Nations, the control services have received instructions to verify in future, the real origin of goods in transit and not only the place where they came from. These measures seem to have been effective, since no other doubtful consignments through the port of Marseilles have been reported to the Sanctions Committee since then."

(2) Note verbale dated 15 May 1971 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"... by reason of confidentiality which is secured by the Foreign Trade Law of the Federal Republic of Germany copies of the ship's papers cannot be made available. The papers examined by the Federal Government for its reply of 5 December 1969 were the ship's manifests.

"However, the Federal Government wishes to stress again that the papers examined provided no indication that the cargo was of Southern Rhodesian origin."

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

See annex III.

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

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

(100) 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.

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

By a note dated 21 April 1971, the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a consignment of frozen meat on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has recently received information from commercial sources, which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation, about the sale of frozen meat suspected to have been supplied by the Rhodesian Cold Storage Commission.

"The information is to the effect that hundreds of tons of this product were recently loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the m.v. Drymakos for carriage to Greece. This vessel, which is owned by Meandros Liners, S.A. of Panama and is of Greek registration, sailed from Lourenço Marques on 31 March for Greece via intermediate ports.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Greece and Panama so as to enable them to investigate the origin and destination of the meat loaded on the m.v. Drymakos at Lourenço Marques on her present voyage. If the importers or shippers should claim that the meat is not of Rhodesian origin the Governments concerned will no doubt wish to bear in mind the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in the Secretary-General's note of 18 September 1969. There has recently been an outbreak of foot-and-mouth

disease in Southern Rhodesia and the usual sanitary measures have been imposed by the local veterinary authorities. It might be suggested therefore that, in addition to any certificates of origin issued at the port of shipment, the importer should be required to produce official certificates showing the origin of the cattle and the slaughter house where the animals were killed."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 30 April and 4 May 1971 to Greece and Panama respectively, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

Reminders were sent to Greece and Panama on 15 September 1971.

Replies have been received from Greece and Panama, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 8 December 1971 from Greece

"The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations... has the honour to forward attached hereto photostatic copy of a certificate of origin certifying that the consignment of frozen meat loaded on board the m.v. Drymakos at Lourenço Marques, last March, was of South African origin."

(2) Note verbale dated 5 April 1972 from Panama

See serial No. 73 above.

A reminder was sent to Panama on 14 June 1972.

A reply dated 7 July has been received from Panama for the substantive part of which see serial No. 108 below.

F. TRADE IN SUGAR

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

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

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reminder was sent to Malaysia on 1 June 1972.

A reply dated 11 October 1972 has been received from Malaysia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations... has the honour to enclose herewith documents 15/ which are self-explanatory regarding the consignment of sugar on board the ship Filotis."

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 27 April 1971 has been received from the Republic of Viet-Nam, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The consignee of the two shipments in Viet-Nam, Van Phat Hang Co., produced a rail note issued by Peritagens E. Conferencias Maritimas LDA., stating that the shipments of sugar were transported by rail from Mozambique sugar mills prior to loading at Lourenço Marques.

"On the other hand, on 15 September 1970, the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, sent an official letter to the Customs Services of Mozambique requesting their co-operation in investigating the origin of shipments of sugar loaded at Lourenço Marques and in destination of Viet-Nam. There has been no answer as of this date.

"In view of this situation and of the absence of consular relations between the Republic of Viet-Nam and Mozambique, which makes any investigation impossible, the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam has decided that effective 1971 bids will not be accepted for the supply of sugar from both Southern Rhodesia and Mozambique. It has been further decided that for sugar imports from other countries, suppliers will have to produce certificates by sugar mills and rail notes (from sugar mills to the ports of loading), in addition to authentic certificates of origin."

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

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

(106) 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.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

15/ As usual, the documents referred to are kept available by the Secretariat.

A reminder was sent to Panama on 5 June 1972.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reminder was sent to Greece, Malawi, Panama and Switzerland on 15 September 1971.

Replies have been received from Switzerland and Panama, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 6 October 1971 from Switzerland

"As is indicated in the note of 22 March 1971 Case No. 112 was brought to the attention of the Swiss Government solely for information purposes inasmuch as the cargo in question appeared to be exclusively of Malawian origin and the Committee had, at its 43rd meeting on 18 March 1971, decided to request the Malawian Government to confirm the origin of the cargo. Accordingly, the competent Swiss authorities have not so far made an investigation of the case."

(2) Note verbale dated 5 April 1972 from Panama

See serial No. 73 above.

A second reminder was sent to Greece and Malawi on 1 June and an automatic reminder to Panama on 5 June 1972.

Replies have been received from Panama and Malawi, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Reply dated 7 July 1972 from Panama^{16/}

"The Panamanian Government is deeply concerned at the reports concerning the alleged violations referred to in previous notes.

"As already stated in our note of 5 April 1972, the Government of Panama believes that the primary responsibility rests with the country under whose flag the vessel sails. However, it is making very serious

16/ The same reply also covers the following cases above:

- (59) Case No. 114 Steel products - "Gemini Exporter"
- (101) Case No. 117 Frozen meat - "Drymakos"
- (88) Case No. 124 Maize - "Armonia"
- (89) Case No. 125 Maize - "Alexandros S"
- (115) Case No. 132 Sugar - "Primrose".

investigations with a view to imposing the relevant penalties upon the companies or enterprises which are found to be violating the provisions laid down in the Security Council resolution referred to above.

"The Government of Panama once again reaffirms its support of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia by the United Nations. In keeping with its anti-colonialist position, it faithfully complies with all provisions designed to promote the self-determination of peoples."

(2) Reply dated 11 August 1972 from Malawi

"The Permanent Representative of the Republic of Malawi to the United Nations... has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General's note verbale dated 1 June 1972, concerning a consignment of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin on the vessel Evangelos M.

"It has been found on investigation that the Sugar Corporation of Malawi, the only institution responsible for exports of sugar from Malawi, has never at any time exported sugar through any firm in Geneva. Secondly, any export of Malawi sugar is accompanied by a certificate of origin obtained from the Blantyre Office of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi. According to the investigation, the sugar referred to in the Secretary-General's note verbale does not appear to be supported by such a certificate of origin, and could not, therefore, have originated from Malawi."

At the Committee's request at its 112th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note dated 10 October 1972 to Greece and Switzerland in view of the reply from Malawi.

A reply dated 8 December 1972 has been received from Switzerland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations... has the honour to refer to his note [the Secretary-General] concerning a consignment of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, reportedly, purchased by a Kuwaiti firm in a transaction with UNIMER S.A., Geneva, and shipped on the Greek vessel Evangelos M from Lourenço Marques to Kuwait in January 1971.

"It can be seen from the foregoing that the transaction took place entirely outside Swiss territory. As the Permanent Observer has already had occasion to explain to the Secretary-General, the Swiss authorities have no legal or practical means at their disposal of intervening in such cases. Under international law, a State can enforce legal provisions only in its own territory."

A reminder was sent to Greece on 8 December 1972.

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

By a note dated 19 March 1971 the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a shipment of sugar on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has recently received information from commercial sources which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation concerning a further sale of sugar suspected to be of Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that several thousand tons of sugar were recently loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the m.v. Aegean Mariner for carriage to Casablanca. The vessel, which is owned by Porto Nacional Cia. Nav., S.A. of Panama and is of Greek registration, is reported to have arrived at Lourenço Marques on 4 February and, after unloading sugar, cleared the same port about 15 or 16 February for Beira arriving at the latter port on 17 February, and clearing the same day for undisclosed destination. It has now been ascertained that the vessel arrived at Casablanca on 11 March.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Morocco in order to assist it in its investigations into the origin of any sugar unloaded from the Aegean Mariner during her present voyage either for use in Morocco or transshipment to other ports. If it is claimed that the sugar is not of Rhodesian origin, the Government of Morocco may wish to bear in mind the advice relating to the reliability of documentation indicated in the Secretary-General's circular of 18 September 1969.

"At the same time the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General to advise the Governments of Panama and Greece of this report so that they may investigate the circumstances in which this sugar, suspected to be of Rhodesian origin, was loaded on a Panamanian-owned vessel, registered in Greece, at Lourenço Marques."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 31 March 1971 to Greece, Panama and Morocco transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reply dated 14 August 1971 has been received from Greece, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of Greece... concerning the m.v. Aegean Mariner has the honour to forward attached hereto photostatic copy of the sugar charter-party in which it is specifically stipulated between the owners of the said ship and the charterers (clause 36) that the cargo in question should be of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Greek authorities would very much appreciate it if the findings of the inquiries carried out by the country of destination were communicated to them for the completion of their own investigations."

A reminder was sent to Morocco and Panama on 15 September 1971.

A reply dated 24 September 1971 has been received from Morocco, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Morocco... has the honour to inform him [the Secretary-General] that the inquiry made by the competent authorities reveals that the certificate of origin makes no mention of Southern Rhodesia and that the shipment in question, which was unloaded at Casablanca, apparently did not come from that country."

At the Committee's request at its 75th meeting a note verbale was sent dated 13 April 1972 to Morocco, asking for further clarification and proof of its findings. The Secretary-General also sent a reminder to Panama on the same day.

A reminder was sent to Morocco, and a second reminder to Panama on 5 June 1972.

A reply dated 11 July 1972 has been received from Morocco,^{17/} the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... the competent Moroccan authorities have made all the necessary inquiries which have established that the transactions referred to were carried out on Moroccan vessels at sea. It has therefore been impossible to ascertain whether the goods were of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"This Mission would also like to inform you that the competent Moroccan authorities have now received the memorandum on the application of sanctions, dated 18 September 1969."

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

By a note dated 10 May 1971, the United Kingdom Government reported information about a consignment of sugar on board the vessel Calli. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"In continuation of its note of 19 March the Government of the United Kingdom now wishes to inform the Committee that it has received further information from commercial sources which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation concerning the sale of a further large consignment of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"Several thousand tons of this commodity were recently loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the m.v. Calli for carriage to Casablanca. This vessel which is owned by the Robertsport Nav. Co. Inc. of Monrovia and is of Liberian registration is reported to have arrived at Lourenço Marques on 17 April and to have cleared the same port on 24 April for Casablanca.

^{17/} The same reply also covers the following cases:

- (110) Case No. 119 Sugar - "Calli"
- (115) Case No. 132 Sugar - "Primrose".

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Morocco in order to assist it in its investigations into the origin of any sugar unloaded from the m.v. Calli during her present voyage either for use in Morocco or transshipment to other countries. At the same time the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General to advise the Government of Liberia so that it may investigate the circumstances in which this consignment of sugar, suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, was loaded at Lourenço Marques on this vessel."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 12 May 1971 to Liberia and Morocco, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reminder was sent to Liberia and Morocco on 2 November 1971.

A reply dated 3 November 1971 has been received from Morocco, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Morocco... further to his note /the Secretary-General/ dated 2 November 1971 and before informing its Government, has the honour to request him kindly to state whether, according to the information in his possession, the m.v. Calli reported to have cleared Lourenço Marques on 24 April 1971 for Casablanca has actually arrived at Casablanca and unloaded its cargo of sugar."

At the Committee's request at its 76th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 April 1972 to Morocco stating that, according to information available to the Committee, the Calli had arrived in Casablanca on 10 May 1971 and requested information, and, if possible, the documents concerning the cargo in question.

A second reminder was sent to Liberia on 1 June and a reminder was sent to Morocco on 5 June 1972.

A reply dated 11 July 1972 has been received from Morocco, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 109 above.

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

By a note dated 13 August 1971, the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a shipment of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin and destined for Israel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has recently received information from commercial sources which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation.

"The information is to the effect that several thousand tons of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin was recently loaded at Lourenço Marques, in the course of her homebound voyage from Durban to Eilat, aboard the m.v. Netanya, for carriage to Israel.

"The m.v. Netanya which is owned by the Zim Israel Navigation Company Limited and is of Israeli registration, called at the port of Lourenço Marques between 29 July and 1 August.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Israel with a view to assisting it in its inquiries into the origin of any sugar which may have been unloaded from this vessel during her present voyage. If the importers or shipping company should claim that the sugar is not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Israeli authorities may wish to bear in mind the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in the Secretary-General's note of 18 September 1969. If, as appears possible, the sugar is declared to be of Mozambique origin, it is suggested that the importer should be required to obtain from his supplier a copy of the 'Boletim de Registro Previo' (exchange control registration certificate) as this document is required for exchange control purposes for all such exports of Mozambique produce."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 August 1971 to Israel, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

An automatic reminder was sent to Israel on 11 February 1972.

A reply dated 7 April 1972 has been received from Israel, ^{18/} the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations... in reply to the Secretary-General's notes of 20 August 1971, 14 October 1971 and 18 February 1972 concerning shipments which according to the aforesaid notes are suspected, on the basis of information from 'commercial sources' to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, has the honour to inform the Secretary-General as follows.

"It is confirmed that the shipments of sugar loaded at Lourenço Marques aboard the m.v. Netanya were destined for Eilat and have arrived at that port. The documents pertaining to these shipments and submitted to the Customs authorities leave no doubt that they are of Mozambique origin. Thus certificates of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce in Lourenço Marques dated 2 August 1971, 20 September 1971 and 14 January 1972, in respect of the three shipments attest that the sugar originated from Mozambique.

"According to the Trade Year Book of FAO (vol. 24, 1970, p. 228), Mozambique exported 170,000 tons of sugar in 1969. From this and other statistical data it is evident that Mozambique is a bona fide source of supply of that commodity. It has also been established that the purchase had been made through a reputable Swiss firm in Geneva and that the contracts of sale dated 7 April 1971 and 17 June 1971 stipulate that the sugar is to be of Mozambique origin.

18/ The same reply also covers the following cases:

- (112) Case No. 126 Sugar - "Netanya"
- (113) Case No. 128 Sugar - "Netanya".

"The Israel authorities have thus concluded that there is no basis for doubt that the above-mentioned shipments are of non-Southern Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request at its 102nd meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 June 1972 to Israel pointing out among other things, that Mozambique export statistics indicated that the sugar exported from Mozambique during the period January-October 1971 went mainly to Portugal.

A reply dated 31 August 1972 has been received from Israel, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"As pointed out in the Permanent Representative's note of 7 April 1972, the Israel authorities relied on the statistics published by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations solely in order to establish the fact that Mozambique was a bone fide source of supply for sugar.

"They did so in pursuance of the Secretary-General's note of 18 September 1969, which suggested that particular attention was required as to the origin of goods exported as the produce of territories in southern and central Africa which, according to their official statistics, are either not produced at all or only produced in limited quantities in the territory concerned.

"In this context it must be added that sugar was not included in the list of goods enumerated in that note, which would require similar attention as being 'of a kind produced in Rhodesia'.

"With respect to the queries of the Committee concerning the 'Boletim de Registro Previo' (exchange control registration certificate), the contracts of sale, as indicated in the Permanent Representative's note of 7 April 1972 had been signed on 7 April 1971 and 17 July 1971, i.e. well before the Secretary-General's note of 27 July 1971, in which he suggested that the presentation of a copy of the 'Boletim de Registro Previo' be required in the case of exports from Mozambique. As a result, that document was not included in the list of shipping papers which the supplier had undertaken to submit under the terms of the contract.

"While the Secretary-General's note of 27 July 1971 does not mention the necessity for any additional documents, as far as shipments of sugar are concerned, the Israel authorities have now received additional documentary evidence to the effect that the sugar in question was produced in Mozambique. This was submitted in the form of a notarized declaration made by a firm of shipping and insurance agents in Lourenço Marques to the effect that they had supervised the transport, by railway, of the bagged sugar from the factory in Mozambique until its loading on the m.v. Netanya. Israel has taken note of Security Council resolution 318 (1972) concerning sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, and will act in accordance therewith, as it has been doing in respect of the previous Security Council resolutions on that subject (253 (1968), 277 (1970) and 314 (1972)) mentioned therein."

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

By a note dated 7 October 1971 the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a shipment of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin and destined to Israel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom, further to its note of 13 August 1971 about a consignment of sugar on the m.v. Netanya, wishes to inform the Committee that it has now received information from commercial sources, which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation about a second consignment of sugar destined for Eilat, Israel.

"The information is to the effect that between 16 and 19 September at the port of Lourenço Marques, the same vessel again loaded several thousand tons of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Israel with a view to assisting it in its investigations into the origin of this second consignment. If the importers or the shipping company should claim that the sugar is not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Israeli authorities will no doubt bear in mind the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in the Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 14 October 1971 to Israel, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reminder was sent to Israel on 11 February 1972.

A reply dated 7 April 1972 has been received from Israel, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 111 above.

At the Committee's request at its 102nd meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 June 1972 to Israel pointing out, among other things, that Mozambique export statistics indicated that the sugar exported from Mozambique during the period January-October 1971 went mainly to Portugal.

A reply dated 31 August 1972 has been received from Israel, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 111 above.

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

By a note dated 11 February 1972, the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning a shipment of sugar, suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin and destined to Israel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom further to its notes of 13 August and 7 October 1971 about consignments of sugar on the m.v. Netanya, wishes to inform the Committee that it has received information from commercial sources, which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation, about a further consignment of sugar destined for off-loading

at Eilat, Israel. The information is to the effect that in the course of a call at the port of Lourenço Marques between 9 and 14 January, the same vessel again loaded several thousand tons of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Israel with a view to assisting it in its investigations into the origin of these three consignments. If the importers or the shipping company should claim that the sugar is not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Israeli authorities will no doubt recall the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in the Secretary-General's notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 and indicate what documents have been produced proving a non-Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 18 February 1972 to Israel transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reply dated 7 April 1972 has been received from Israel for the substantive part of which see serial No. 111 above.

At the Committee's request at its 102nd meeting the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 June 1972 to Israel pointing out, among other things, that Mozambique export statistics indicated that the sugar exported from Mozambique during the period January-October 1971 went mainly to Portugal.

A reply dated 31 August 1972 has been received from Israel, for the substantive part of which see serial No. 111 above.

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

By a note dated 12 April 1972 the United Kingdom Government reported information about a consignment of sugar on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wishes to inform the Committee that it has received information from commercial sources which it considers sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation concerning a large consignment of sugar, suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that between 16 and 24 February while in port at Lourenço Marques, the Cypriot-owned and registered motor vessel Mariner loaded a cargo of several thousands of tons of this commodity and sailed on 24 February for Yugoslavia. The vessel arrived at Split on 18 March having made no intermediate calls.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Yugoslavia in order to assist it in its investigations into the origin of any sugar unloaded from the m.v. Mariner. If the importers of the shipping company should claim that the sugar is not of

Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 with a request for an indication of any relevant documents advanced as evidence of a non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the attention of the Government of Cyprus so as to assist it in any investigation which it may wish to make into the carriage aboard by a Cypriot vessel of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

The United Kingdom note was communicated to the members of the Committee at the 81st meeting held on 17 April 1972 at which the representative of Yugoslavia took note of the matter and indicated that an investigation would be conducted by his Government.

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 26 June 1972 to Cyprus, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon. On the same day a reminder was sent to Yugoslavia inquiring whether any relevant information could now be made available to the Committee.

A reply dated 24 August 1972 has been received from Yugoslavia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the United Nations... further to the statement made by the Yugoslav Representative at the 81st meeting of the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia, held on 17 April 1972, has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the contents of the United Kingdom Government's note of 12 April 1972 containing information to the effect that between 16 and 24 February 1972, while in the port of Lourenço Marques, the Cypriot vessel Mariner loaded a cargo of several thousand tons of sugar and sailed on 24 February 1972 for Yugoslavia, arriving at Split on 18 March 1972, having made no intermediate calls - were urgently brought to the direct attention of the Yugoslav Government, the Federal Executive Council, as well as to that of the highest constitutional authorities of Yugoslavia.

"After having considered it, as a matter of urgency, the Yugoslav Government instructed the District Public Prosecutor's Office in Belgrade to make, without delay, a detailed and thorough investigation on the basis of the existing Federal Law Prohibiting the Establishment and Maintenance of Commercial and other Relations with Southern Rhodesia, adopted in 1968.

"As a result of that investigation, the District Public Prosecutor's Office concluded, on the basis of the documents supplied by the importing enterprise Centroprom that the sugar was not of Southern Rhodesian origin and that, consequently, there were no grounds for initiating criminal proceedings under the provision of the above-mentioned law. The said conclusion was based on the following documents: (a) Contract concluded between Centroprom and the firm Unimer from Geneva, an affiliation of the French company Sucre et Denrées, in which it is pointed out that the origin

of the sugar is subject to the option of the vendor, with the exception of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia; and (b) Certificate of the Chamber of Commerce in Lourenço Marques, stating that the sugar is of Portuguese origin. (The copies of the above-mentioned documents are enclosed.)

"Since Yugoslav public prosecutors' offices as well as courts bring their decisions on the basis of presented proofs, there was no legal possibility in the case under consideration, in the view of the District Public Prosecutor's Office, to apply the above-mentioned law, as, according to the formal evidence, the goods were not of Southern Rhodesian but of Portuguese origin.

"However, after having obtained the findings of the District Public Prosecutor's Office, the Yugoslav Government decided that further investigations and measures were necessary in this case, since it is widely known - as the Secretary-General indicated in his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971 that the Chamber of Commerce certificates cannot be regarded as a sufficient proof of origin, especially in the case of goods exported from Mozambique and since it is common knowledge that sanctions against Southern Rhodesia are being violated in a variety of ways, especially through Portuguese territories.

"Consequently, resolved to do its utmost with a view to ensuring the effectiveness of sanctions, mindful of the necessity of further measures in order to prevent the direct or indirect violation of sanctions, especially through Portuguese territories, dedicated to the strictest implementation of all Security Council resolutions pertaining to Southern Rhodesia and in keeping with its basic and tested policy of support and assistance to the liberation and independence of all African nations, the Yugoslav Government decided to take further action with regard to this case, which resulted in the following:

"(1) On the basis of existing Government decrees (enacted in keeping with the General Assembly resolutions on Portuguese colonies) prohibiting commercial transactions and trade arrangements with Portugal, the District Public Prosecutor's Office proceeded to a new investigation, this time on the basis of charges under articles 139 and 115 of the Federal Law Regulating the Exchange of Goods and Services with Foreign Countries, which make it incumbent upon business enterprises and their representatives to protect the reputation, good name and honour of their country as well as their own, in their transactions abroad. The Public Prosecutor's Office brought in an indictment against the enterprise Centroprom and its General Manager and criminal proceedings are now in course.

"Thus, because of legal obstacles to the initiation of criminal proceedings on the basis of the Federal Law Prohibiting Economic and Other Relations with Southern Rhodesia, criminal proceedings have been instituted on the basis of the Federal Law Regulating the Exchange of Goods and Services with Foreign Countries.

"(2) In the meantime, the Federal Foreign Currency Inspectorate decided, on the basis of article 12a of the Federal Law on Foreign Currency, to impose a severe fine on the said enterprise preventing it from obtaining

any financial gains from the transaction. This action was taken because Centroprom, in its statement to the Service for the Documentary Control of Foreign Currency of the National Bank of Yugoslavia, which is a necessary procedure in these matters - had originally incorrectly stated that the goods in question were of French origin, thus making it impossible for the said Service to prevent the import of products from Portuguese colonies, which would have happened, in keeping with the above-mentioned Government decrees, had the statement been correct.

"(3) For the same reason, the Federal Foreign Currency Inspectorate referred the case of Centroprom and its General Manager to the Court of Honour of the Federal Chamber of Economy.

"(4) The requirements and suggestions given in the Secretary-General's above-mentioned notes have again been brought to the attention of the competent Yugoslav authorities for the purpose of adopting additional regulations for the application of the Federal Law Prohibiting the Establishment and Maintenance of Economic and Other Relations with Southern Rhodesia of 1968.

"The Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia wishes to assure the Secretary-General that it would have prevented the importation of the said shipment, had it been possible for the information concerning the suspected violation to reach it before the shipment arrived in the Yugoslav port, irrespective of whether it was believed to be of Southern Rhodesian or of Portuguese (Mozambique) origin.

"Indeed, in the opinion of the Yugoslav Government, this case has once again underlined the relevance of numerous requests voiced in the General Assembly, the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations, to the effect that sanctions against Southern Rhodesia can be fully effective only if they are applied against Portugal and South Africa as well.

"For its part, in order further to contribute to the more effective implementation of sanctions the Yugoslav Government is in the process of initiating procedures aimed at tightening the existing and instituting additional measures for the prevention of commercial transactions and trade relations with Portugal, measures designed to broaden, at the same time, the existing legal framework for preventing trade with Southern Rhodesia."

A reminder was sent to Cyprus on 4 December 1972.

A reply dated 13 December 1972 has been received from Cyprus, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations... has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the Government of the Republic of Cyprus is investigating the consignment of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin on the vessel Mariner. Upon completion of the said investigation the reply of the Cyprus Government regarding the matter in question will be forwarded."

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

By a note dated 26 April 1972 the United Kingdom Government reported information concerning the shipment of a further large consignment of sugar on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wishes to inform the Committee that it has received information from commercial sources which it considers sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation concerning the shipment of a further large consignment of sugar, suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

"The information is to the effect that between 25 February and 9 March the m.v. Primrose was at the Port of Lourenço Marques where she loaded a consignment of several thousand tons of sugar and that she then sailed on 9 March for Casablanca and Tangier. The vessel, which is owned by Sider Line Cia. de Nav. SA of Panama and is of Liberian registration, arrived at Casablanca on 31 March and sailed on 6 April for Tangier, leaving again for Casablanca on 11 April and arriving on 14 April.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests 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 Government of Morocco in order to assist it in its investigations into the origin of any sugar unloaded from the m.v. Primrose.

"Should the importers or the shipping company claim that the sugar is not of Southern Rhodesian origin, the Secretary-General may further wish to draw attention to the suggestions relating to documentary proof of origin contained in his notes of 18 September 1969 and 27 July 1971, and to request the Government of Morocco to indicate which documents have been produced as evidence that the sugar was of non-Rhodesian origin.

"The Committee may also wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the attention of the Governments of Panama and of Liberia so as to assist them in any investigation which they may wish to make into the carriage aboard the Panama-owned and Liberian-registered vessel of sugar suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin."

At the Committee's request following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 16 May 1972 to Liberia, Panama and Morocco transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

Replies have been received from Panama and Morocco, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 7 July 1972 from Panama

See serial No. 108 above.

(2) Note verbale dated 11 July 1972 from Morocco

See serial No. 109 above.

G. TRADE IN FERTILIZERS AND AMMONIA

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

An acknowledgement dated 8 March 1971 has been received from Canada.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reminder was sent to Australia, Iran and Portugal on 7 July 1971.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

An acknowledgement dated 8 March 1971 has been received from Canada.

A reminder was sent to Australia, Iran and Portugal on 7 July 1971.

Replies have been received from Australia and Iran, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

- (1) Note verbale dated 15 July 1971 from Australia

"The Permanent Representative wishes to inform the Secretary-General that pursuant to its obligations under the Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions on Southern Rhodesia, the Australian Government made special regulations designed to ensure that no anhydrous ammonia shipped from Australia is supplied to Southern Rhodesia. Before any shipment of anhydrous ammonia is exported to an African port from Australia, the Australian Government has to be satisfied from documentary evidence produced to it that such shipment is not destined for Southern Rhodesia and that it is not to be re-exported to that country."

(2) Note verbale dated 3 August 1971 from Iran

"The Permanent Representative of Iran to the United Nations... has the honour to inform that according to a communication received from the National Petrochemical Company, no contract has been signed to supply Southern Rhodesia with anhydrous ammonia produced in Iran."

A second reminder was sent to Portugal on 1 June 1972.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reminder was sent to Australia, Iran and Portugal on 7 July 1971.

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reminder was sent to Australia, Iran and Portugal on 7 July 1971.

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A note dated 8 April 1971 to the Secretary-General's note verbale of 20 January 1971 has been received from the Netherlands, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"In this connexion the Permanent Representative wishes to refer to his note of 22 May 1970 (see S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial no. 101, para. 4) and to inform the Secretary-General that no ammonia was exported in 1970 from the Netherlands to Mozambique."

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

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A further note concerning another shipment of anhydrous ammonia on the vessel Isfonn was submitted by the United Kingdom on 3 March 1971. The text of the note is reproduced below.

"In its note of 29 January the Government of the United Kingdom reported information concerning the carriage to Lourenço Marques by the Norwegian owned motor tanker Isfonn of anhydrous ammonia believed to be destined for Southern Rhodesia. Further information has now been received which the Government of the United Kingdom considers warrants investigation.

"The information is to the effect that when the discharge of the cargo mentioned above at Lourenço Marques was completed by the m.t. Isfonn soon after 26 December, the vessel proceeded to the port of Bandar Shapur where another cargo of more than 12,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia supplied by the National Petrochemical Company of Iran, was loaded. The vessel sailed from Bandar Shapur on 17 January arriving at Lourenço Marques at the end of January.

"As in the case reported in the Government of the United Kingdom's note of 29 January, it is believed that the arrangements for this consignment from Iran were also made by the South African firm National Process Industries (Pty) Ltd., who are known to be involved with the Sable Chemical Company of Southern Rhodesia.

"Having regard to the information given in the Government of the United Kingdom's note of 29 January and in earlier notes of 24 September, 15 October and 10 November 1969, 7 January, 13 February, 2 April and 9 April 1970 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VII, serial nos. 65, 66, 67 and 68), the Government of the United Kingdom suggests that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the notice of the Governments of Iran and Norway with a view to assisting it to investigate the supply and carriage of anhydrous ammonia which, on the information available to the United Kingdom Government, would appear to be destined ultimately for Southern Rhodesia."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent further notes verbales dated 15 March 1971 to Iran and Norway, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

Replies have been received from Iran and Switzerland, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 6 April 1971 from Iran

"... according to a communication received from the National Petrochemical Company of Iran a contract has been signed for supplying ammonia to the Terminal Operator, Ltd., which is a European firm established in Liechtenstein, but the National Petrochemical Company of Iran has no direct or indirect dealings whatsoever with Southern Rhodesia."

(2) Note verbale dated 4 March 1971 from Switzerland

"According to the information supplied by the Japanese Government '10,000 metric tons of anhydrous ammonia destined for Mozambique were sold to the Société d'avances commerciales at Geneva (Switzerland) and 12,000 metric tons of anhydrous ammonia destined for the Republic of South Africa were sold to Adab S. A. at Geneva (Switzerland), in each case f.o.b.'. It appears from the investigation into this matter carried out by the federal authorities that the transactions of the two Swiss firms in question take place mainly outside Swiss territory. Consequently, the federal authorities are not in a position to take any legal or practical action in the matter. Under international public law, each State is entitled to apply legal norms only in its own territory, and the Swiss authorities therefore cannot take any measures that would contravene international positive law."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note dated 21 July 1971 to Liechtenstein, transmitting the information received from Iran.

A reply dated 21 September 1971 has been received from Liechtenstein, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Head of the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein... has the honour to supply the following information... concerning shipments of sal ammoniac probably intended for Southern Rhodesia.

"The undertaking Terminal Operator Ltd., mentioned in the communication from the Iranian Government reproduced in the second paragraph of the Secretary-General's note of 21 July 1971 is not listed in the commercial register of the Principality of Liechtenstein. This undertaking therefore has no existence under Liechtenstein law; it cannot be legally established in Liechtenstein and it has no capacity to perform legally valid acts as a Liechtenstein undertaking.

"Consequently, information to the effect that a firm by the name of Terminal Operator, Ltd., is an undertaking established in Liechtenstein is erroneous and has no basis in fact."

A reminder was sent to Norway on 15 September 1971.

At the Committee's request at its 74th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note dated 6 April 1972 to Iran, transmitting the information submitted by Liechtenstein and asking it to carry out further investigations, in view of that information.

A reminder was sent to Iran and a second reminder to Norway on 1 June 1972.

At its 112th meeting on 13 September 1972 the Committee decided that reminders should be sent to Iran and Norway drawing their attention to the complexity of the case and seeking any further information that might help to clarify it.

A note dated 10 October 1972 was sent to Iran accordingly, but no note was sent to Norway, as a reply dated 14 September 1972 was received from that country, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... The matter has been carefully investigated by the competent Norwegian authorities who are in the position to submit the following information.

"In accordance with contracts between the Norwegian owners of the two above-mentioned gas-tankers and a French Company, Gazocean of Paris, the charter of the ships is carried out from Paris without the participation of the Norwegian shipping companies. Both Norwegian shipping companies in question have included the following clause in their co-operation contracts with Gazocean:

"'No transfer to be performed or continue to be performed under this agreement which by government or authorities of the country of registration or any other government or authorities concerned may be deemed to be forbidden by any resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations as to the shipment of goods originating from or destined for Southern Rhodesia.'

"In the view of the Norwegian Government the role of the transportation link in these matters should not be emphasized to an extent that would tend to obscure and alleviate the responsibility for possible violations of the sanctions on the part of other Governments, such as the Government of the exporting country as well as the Government of the country of the Charterer. The Norwegian Government will for its part continue to do its utmost to prevent participation by enterprises and individuals under Norwegian jurisdiction in transactions contrary to pertinent Security Council decisions."

A reminder was sent to Iran on 8 December 1972.

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

By a note dated 30 August 1971 the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of ammonia on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"In their notes of 24 September, 15 October, and 10 November 1969, 7 January, 13 February, 2 April and 9 April 1970 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VII, serial Nos. 65, 66, 67 and 68), 29 January (see S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial No. 105) and 3 March 1971 (see serial No. 122 above) the Government of the United Kingdom reported information obtained from commercial sources about the supply of anhydrous ammonia to Southern Rhodesia and about the companies involved. The Government of the United Kingdom has now received further information from commercial sources which it considers to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation.

"The information is to the effect that between 29 June and 2 July 1971, the Liberian-owned motor tanker Znon, registered in Panama, was at the

port of Bandar Shapur where it loaded a cargo of approximately 10,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia, The vessel left Bandar Shapur on 2 July declared for Lourenço Marques. As in the case reported in the Government of the United Kingdom's note of 3 March, it is believed that the arrangements for this consignment from Iran were made by the South African firm, National Process Industries (Pty), who are known to be involved with the Sable Chemical Company of Southern Rhodesia.

"Having regard to the information given in the Government of the United Kingdom's notes mentioned above, it is suggested that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the notice of the Governments of Iran, Liberia and Panama, with a view to assisting them to investigate the supply and carriage of anhydrous ammonia which, on the information available to the Government of the United Kingdom, would appear to be destined ultimately for Southern Rhodesia. Should a South African destination be claimed for the cargo, the Government of the United Kingdom wishes to bring to the attention of the Committee that in such a case a permit issued by the South African Government would be required, and, presumably, would be available for inspection by the consignor."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 7 September 1971 to Iran, Liberia and Panama, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reminder was sent to Iran and Liberia on 11 February 1972.

A reminder was sent to Panama on 5 June 1972.

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

By a note dated 24 February 1972 the United Kingdom reported information concerning a shipment of anhydrous ammonia on the above vessel. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"In their notes of 24 September, 15 October and 10 November 1969, 7 January, 13 February, 2 April, and 9 April 1970 (see S/9844/Rev.1, annex VII, serial Nos. 65, 66, 67 and 68), 29 January (see S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, annex I, serial No. 105), 3 March (see serial No. 122 above) and 30 August 1971 (see serial No. 123 above), the Government of the United Kingdom reported information obtained from commercial sources about the supply of anhydrous ammonia to Southern Rhodesia and about the companies involved. The Government of the United Kingdom have received further information from commercial sources which they consider to be sufficiently reliable to warrant investigation.

"The information is to the effect that between 5 and 6 January the Norwegian-owned and registered motor tanker Kristian Birkeland was at the port of Bandar Shapur, Iran, where it loaded a cargo of several thousand tons of anhydrous ammonia. The vessel left Bandar Shapur on 6 January and arrived at Lourenço Marques on 23 January.

"As was made clear in the note circulated by the Secretary-General on 27 July 1971, regulations in force in Mozambique require an importer of goods intended for use in Mozambique to register all imports, with certain minor exceptions, for exchange control purposes. The importer is then given a certificate, "Boletim de Registro Previo", and only with this can he obtain foreign exchange to pay for the imports. Similarly only certain products can be imported into South Africa from any country without an import permit and anhydrous ammonia is not included in the list of exempted products. The inability to produce a photocopy of one of these documents may be taken as prima facie evidence that the consignment is not for use in Mozambique or South Africa. Furthermore, South Africa is normally self-supporting in anhydrous ammonia and the published figures of the importation into Mozambique of this product indicate a requirement of less than 1,000 tons per annum.

"Having regard to this information and to that given in the Government of the United Kingdom's notes mentioned above and also to the data contained in the note on imports of ammonia into Southern Rhodesia (annex V to the fourth report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)), it is considered likely that the ammonia carried on this vessel is destined for the Sable Chemical Company, Que Que. It is suggested that the Committee may wish to ask the Secretary-General to bring this information to the notice of the Governments of Iran and Norway with a view to assisting them to investigate the supply and carriage of anhydrous ammonia which on the information available to the United Kingdom Government, would appear to be destined ultimately for Southern Rhodesia."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent notes verbales dated 1 March 1972 to Iran and Norway, transmitting the United Kingdom note and requesting comments thereon.

A reminder was sent to Iran and Norway on 1 June 1972.

A reply dated 13 July 1972 has been received from Norway, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The matter has been investigated by the competent Norwegian authorities who wish to submit the following information:

"The vessel Kristian Birkeland is on time charter from Gazocean, Paris. In accordance with the contract between Gazocean and the shipping company, the chartering and operation of the ship is carried out from Paris without the participation of the shipping company. It is stated in the freight contract between Gazocean and the importer that 'owners shall not be required to perform any voyage which, by the order of the government or authorities of the country of registration of the vessel or by any other relevant government or authority, is forbidden by reason or consequence of any resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations concerning the shipment of goods originating from or destined for Southern Rhodesia.'

"The shipping company has furthermore raised the matter directly with Gazocean which has declared that the shipment of anhydrous ammonia from Iran to Lourenço Marques is not in violation of the above-mentioned guidelines as the consignment had been purchased by a South African firm for resale to

fertilizer manufacturers in the Republic of South Africa. The shipping company has also obtained a sworn declaration from the Director of the South African firm (Transvaal Chemical Traders (Proprietary), Limited) to the effect that this firm had bought the supply of 13,000 metric tons of anhydrous ammonia from National Petrochemical Company in Iran, and that the whole of this consignment has been sold to fertilizer manufacturers in South Africa. The original of this affidavit is enclosed.

"The Norwegian authorities would furthermore like to point out that all importation of anhydrous ammonia destined for southern Africa goes through the harbour of Lorenzo Marques where the only reception facilities for anhydrous ammonia are located. All importation of anhydrous ammonia destined for South Africa is therefore also routed through Lorenzo Marques."

At the Committee's request at its 114th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a second reminder dated 4 October 1972 to Iran.

A reply dated 4 October 1972 has been received from Iran, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Iran to the United Nations... has the honour to inform that the matter has been under investigation by competent Iranian authorities and the result will be communicated on a later date when the investigations have been completed."

H. MOTOR VEHICLES

(125) 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 fourth report.

I. CYCLE ACCESSORIES

(126) Case No. 88 Cycle accessories: United Kingdom note dated 13 August 1970

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

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 9 February 1972 has been received from Czechoslovakia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"... The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has already declared on many occasions that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has always consistently fulfilled and will fulfil all provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations. In this connexion, the Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has the honour to recall, for example, his note of 3 February 1969 (see S/8786/Add.6, annex). As to the note of the United Kingdom of 13 August 1970 concerning an alleged consignment of

twelve packages of cycle accessories manufactured in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and sent to Salisbury from Mozambique, the investigation undertaken by the Czechoslovak authorities in connexion with the above information fully reaffirmed the fact that no Czechoslovak trade organization violated the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and was in any relation to the above consignment.

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and does not maintain with it either diplomatic or commercial or any other relations which the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had the honour to communicate repeatedly in its preceding responses to the notes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

J. TRACTOR KITS

(127) 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.

K. AIRCRAFT

(128) 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.

(129) 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.

L. DIESEL ELECTRIC LOCOMOTIVES

(130) Case No. 111 Traction equipment for diesel electric locomotives: United Kingdom note dated 15 January 1971

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

Replies have been received from Canada and France, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 4 March 1971 from Canada

"... Canadian officials will continue in their efforts to ensure full compliance with the provisions of the Rhodesia Regulations which were adopted by the Government of Canada in implementation of Security Council resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968). To the best of the knowledge of the Canadian authorities, Canadian firms are not contravening these regulations and it is not expected that they will attempt to do so in the present case."

(2) Note verbale dated 8 March 1971 from France

"... the investigation carried out by the French services has not revealed that any French firm has been contacted by Rhodesian firms or South African intermediaries. This type of business, as mentioned in the United Kingdom note, is anyhow strictly forbidden by the French regulations."

(3) Further note verbale dated 22 March 1971 from Canada

"In so far as the Canadian authorities are aware no approach has been made to Canadian suppliers for locomotive traction equipment intended for Rhodesia Railways."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a reminder to Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland on 19 July 1971; Belgium, Japan and the USSR, members of the Committee from whom replies to the Secretary-General's note verbale of 25 January 1971 were still awaited, took note of the matter at the meeting.

Replies have been received from the Federal Republic of Germany, Austria, Japan, Belgium, Switzerland and Sweden, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 25 June 1971 from the Federal Republic of Germany

"By letter of 26 June 1970, the Federal Ministry of Economics has drawn the attention of the Export Association of the Germany Locomotive Industry (Exportförderungsverband der Deutschen Lokomotivindustrie) to the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and to the relevant export restrictions. In addition, the Association of German Industries (Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie) has been requested to advise its member firms concerned of the existing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia."

(2) Note verbale dated 3 July 1971 from Austria

"Investigations carried out by the Austrian competent authorities brought no evidence of diesel locomotives of Austrian origin having been delivered to Rhodesia Railways."

(3) Note verbale dated 15 July 1971 from Japan

"The Government of Japan drew the attention of the Japanese business circles concerned, through the Japan Machinery Exporters Association, to the contents of the above-mentioned note of the United Kingdom."

"The Government will continue to pay close attention to this matter and, if and when any application for licence to export diesel electric traction equipment to South Africa is submitted, will take all precautionary measures to prevent any possible evasion of sanctions including determination of the end user of the equipment."

(4) Note verbale dated 16 July 1971 from Belgium

"... with reference to the alleged export to Southern Rhodesia of diesel engines for locomotives, I have the honour to inform you, on instructions from my Government, that the export of such equipment is not subject to licence. The Belgian authorities have no knowledge of any possible sale to South Africa of equipment of this kind unless assistance is requested from the National Del Credere Office. I would add that no transaction of this kind has so far come to the knowledge of that Office."

(5) Note verbale dated 2 September 1971 from Switzerland

"In this connexion, the Permanent Observer wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Trade Division of the Federal Department of Public Economy at Bern has drawn the attention of those Swiss manufacturers who may be concerned to the contents of the note dated 15 January 1971 from the United Kingdom mission. At the same time, the Trade Division informed those manufacturers that in the case of transactions of the kind referred to in the United Kingdom note, the Federal authorities would refuse to provide any guarantee against export risks.

"Thus far, the Federal authorities have not been made aware, either directly or indirectly, that any orders for locomotives or parts having typically Rhodesian specifications have been placed with manufacturers in Switzerland."

(6) Note verbale dated 7 September 1971 from Sweden

"Having examined the questions raised by the Secretary-General, the competent Swedish authorities are now in a position to state that no Swedish manufacturers of diesel electric locomotives have been involved in contacts of the kind mentioned in the note from the Secretary-General of 25 January 1971, and there are no plans from the part of the same Swedish manufacturers to establish any such contacts with the firm mentioned in the same note from the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

At the Committee's request at its 74th meeting the Secretary-General sent a reminder dated 6 April 1972 to Spain.

A reply dated 12 May 1972 has been received from Spain, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations... is pleased to inform him [the Secretary-General] that the competent Spanish authorities have already been duly instructed in the matter with a view to the strict observance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)."

At its 111th meeting the Committee decided that no further action was necessary on this case which should therefore be considered closed.

M. BOOK-KEEPING AND ACCOUNTING MACHINES

(131) 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.

N. SHIRTS

(132) 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.

O. OTHER CASES

(133) Case No. 27 Memorandum on the application of sanctions: note by the Secretary-General dated 18 September 1969

See S/9844/Rev.1, annex VI.

(134) Case No. 120 Southern Rhodesia and the Olympic Games: note from the Federal Republic of Germany dated 5 April 1971

Previous information concerning this case is contained in the fourth report (S/10229 and Add.1 and 2, paras. 77-79).

Additional information received by the Committee since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

At the Committee's request at its 106th meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 18 August 1972 to the Federal Republic of Germany drawing that Government's attention to the possible breach of the Security Council's sanctions arising from the reported arrival into the Federal Republic of Germany of a team of athletes from Southern Rhodesia for the purpose of participating in the 1972 Olympic Games, and requesting the Government to inform the Committee of any actions it had taken to ensure that no violations of the Security Council's resolutions on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia might occur.

An acknowledgement dated 21 August 1972 has been received from the Acting Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations stating that the Secretary-General's note had been transmitted to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

A further reply dated 28 August 1972 has been received from the Federal Republic of Germany the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Acting Permanent Observer of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations... has the honour to transmit the following reply by this Government to the Secretary-General's note of 18 August 1972:

"1. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has considered the Secretary-General's note a valuable assistance in its endeavours to bring about a solution by the International Olympic Committee to the question of the participation of a team from Southern Rhodesia in the Olympic Games in Munich.

"In compliance with the suggestion of the Sanctions Committee the Federal Government transmitted the text of the Secretary-General's note to the International Olympic Committee which is alone responsible for the Olympic Games.

"2. The Federal Government has in its communications to the International Olympic Committee never left any room for doubt as to its respect for United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"3. On 22 August 1972, the International Olympic Committee decided to withdraw its invitation to the team of Southern Rhodesia to take part in the Olympic Games in Munich.'..."

(135) Case No. 121 Documentation required for exports from and imports into Mozambique: United Kingdom note dated 17 June 1971

By a note dated 17 June 1971 the United Kingdom Government reported information about the documentation required for exports from or importation into Mozambique. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"Information has recently come to light on regulations in force in Mozambique whereby, with a few minor exceptions, all transactions affecting goods originating in and exported from Mozambique must be registered for exchange control purposes. The registration is recorded in a certificate 'Boletim de Registro Previo', a copy of which is held by the exporter. The issue of this certificate must be followed in due course by the surrender of foreign exchange to a Mozambique bank. The Secretary-General might wish to suggest, in those cases where investigation by a Government takes place and the goods in question are described as exports originating in Mozambique, that the importer be required to produce a photocopy of the certificate in possession of the Mozambique exporter as evidence of Mozambique origin. Inability to produce a photocopy of this document would be a prima facie indication that the goods did not originate in Mozambique.

"Similarly with regard to goods imported into and intended for use in Mozambique, the regulations provide for the same registration (again with a few minor exceptions). The 'Boletim de Registro Previo' is required in order to obtain foreign exchange for payment for imports. Inability to produce a photocopy of the document would therefore be a prima facie indication that the goods in question were intended for destinations other than Mozambique.

"Further information on documentation required for exports from Mozambique, which may be helpful in confirming a Mozambique origin, can be summarized as follows:

"(a) Cereals (maize, rice, wheat, ground-nuts, soya, etc.)

- "(i) Export authorization issued by Mozambique Cereals Institute;
- "(ii) Certificates of origin issued by Mozambique Cereals Institute;
- "(iii) Receipt for tax paid, issued by Mozambique Customs.

"(b) Tobacco

- "(i) Receipt for tax paid, issued by Mozambique Customs;
- "(ii) Way-bills for transport of tobacco within Mozambique, issued by registered growers, co-operative bodies (gremios) or civil authorities;
- "(iii) Certificate of origin issued by the Mozambique Agricultural Services or co-operative body (gremio).

"(c) Raw ginned cotton

- "(i) Export authorization issued by Mozambique Cotton Institute;
- "(ii) Certificate of origin issued by Mozambique Cotton Institute;
- "(iii) Receipt for tax paid to Mozambique Cotton Institute;

(Note: Almost all raw cotton exported from Mozambique goes to Portugal.)

"(d) Forest products

- "(i) Way-bills (guia de trânsito) for transport of products within Mozambique;
- "(ii) Certificate of origin (certificado de qualidade e conservação) issued by Serviços de Agricultura e Florestas;
- "(iii) Receipt for exploitation dues."

At the Committee's request at its 60th meeting the Secretary-General transmitted the United Kingdom note to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies except Portugal and South Africa on 27 July 1971.

Acknowledgements of the Secretary-General's note have been received from Indonesia dated 29 July 1971, the Republic of Viet-Nam dated 29 July 1971 and Nauru dated 12 August 1971.

Replies have been received from Nicaragua and the Netherlands, the substantive parts of which read as follows:

(1) Note verbale dated 23 September 1971 from Nicaragua

"... I am reproducing below part of the note from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua to this Permanent Mission regarding the communication in question:

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has noted the contents of the note of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and in particular its decision to request the Secretary-General to transmit a copy of the above-mentioned note to my Government in order to assist it in efforts to make fully effective the Security Council's decisions on the implementation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

"This is an appropriate occasion to repeat once again and, through your offices, to inform the Secretary-General that it is our Government's unswerving policy to act in all instances in conformity with the resolutions and agreements adopted by the General Assembly, which contribute to the noble cause of justice, peace and the advancement of peoples."

(2) Note verbale dated 8 February 1972 from the Netherlands

"... The Netherlands Government has brought the contents of the annex attached to the above-mentioned note to the attention of the officials concerned with the control of imports, of shipping companies sailing to southern Africa, of the importers of goods originating in southern Africa as well as to the attention of exporters of goods intended for that region."

(136) Case No. 127 Eastern Trading Company (Pty) Limited - Swaziland: United Kingdom note dated 28 October 1971

By a note dated 28 October 1971 the United Kingdom Government reported information to the effect that various embargoed goods are reaching Southern Rhodesia through the agency of an intermediary in Swaziland. The text of the note is reproduced below:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has received information which it considers sufficiently reliable to merit investigation by the Committee set up in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"The information is to the effect that various embargoed goods are reaching Southern Rhodesia through the agency of a particular intermediary in Swaziland. The procedure is as follows: Southern Rhodesia indent for various requirements on the Eastern Trading Company (Pty) Limited, P. O. Box 109, Manzini, Swaziland, a subsidiary of Rennie's Consolidated Holdings, 30 Melle Street, Fraamfontein, Johannesburg. Eastern Trading Company (Pty) Limited then order from the appropriate manufacturer in their own name and also arrange for payment to be made. The manufacturer is instructed to consign the goods via Lourenço Marques and to send the documents immediately the goods are shipped to Rennie's Consolidated (Lourenço Marques (Pty) Limited, P. O. Box 292, Lourenço Marques) who arrange clearance of the consignment on arrival and for it to be forwarded direct to Southern Rhodesia. So far as can be discovered Eastern Trading Company (Pty) Limited has no legitimate trading or other business interests in Swaziland.

"The Government of the United Kingdom suggests that the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) may wish to ask the Secretary-General of the United Nations to give this information wider distribution in accordance with the usual procedure agreed at the twenty-fifth meeting of the Committee, so that all manufacturers and exporters in the countries concerned may be aware of the probability that goods supplied as a result of orders placed by or on behalf of Eastern Trading Company (Pty) Limited will eventually be delivered to companies in Rhodesia in breach of United Nations sanctions."

At the Committee's request, following informal consultations, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 16 November 1971 to all the Member States or members of the specialized agencies, so that the activities of the agency in question, in violation of the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, might be brought to the attention of any manufacturers and exporters potentially concerned.

Acknowledgements have been received from the Republic of Viet-Nam, the Federal Republic of Germany, Mexico, Zaire, Greece, Qatar and New Zealand.

At the Committee's request at its 102nd meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 June 1972 to Swaziland again requesting comments of the Government of Swaziland on the matter.

A reply dated 14 July 1972 has been received from Swaziland, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Swaziland to the United Nations... has the honour, in accordance with instructions from the Swaziland Government, to outline the action taken with regard to the incident in accordance with the breach of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) which occurred in Swaziland that 'the Swaziland Government has warned everyone resident in Swaziland that it is an offence to trade with Rhodesia in any way. A Manzini firm was raided by the Royal Swaziland Police, and documents found there have been taken away "for further study". A director of the firm, a Manzini resident, was questioned "regarding alleged business transactions in Rhodesia".'

"Further the Government statement says: 'In conformity with its obligations under the United Nations Charter, and the Southern Rhodesia (U.N. Sanctions) Order, 1968, the Swaziland Government wishes to remind all persons resident in Swaziland that it is an offence, under the above order, to import goods of Rhodesian origin into Swaziland, or to supply, or assist in supplying, goods to Rhodesia without permit to do so from the Swaziland Government.'"

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

See annex III.

(138) Case No. 136 Import of sculptural objects from Southern Rhodesia: Swedish letter dated 25 October 1972

See annex III.

ANNEX III

CASES OF TRANSACTIONS CONDUCTED WITH THE CONSENT OF
THE REPORTING GOVERNMENTS

Cases contained in the fourth report

GRAPHITE

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

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

MEAT

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

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A reply dated 14 April 1972 has been received from France, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"When the meats presumed to be of Rhodesian origin were unloaded from the (Taveta and) Polana, no fraudulent intent was discovered in the declarations made by the forwarding agents. At that time they were not obliged to furnish a certificate of origin for goods in international transit to Switzerland. As usual, the information provided mentioned only the place where the goods had come from, i.e. the country of embarkation. The 70 metric tons of frozen meats transported by the Taveta had been embarked in South Africa and the 50 metric tons of ox tongues and livers had been loaded on the Polana in a Mozambique port.

"It has not been possible to obtain further information on the operations effected by the (Taveta and) Polana, since the vessels are German and the documents accompanying the goods which they were transporting have been delivered to the Swiss consignees. As the latter have recognized the Rhodesian origin of the goods, the French control services consider the matter closed.

"It should be added that following the requests for an enquiry made by the United Nations, the control services have received instructions to verify, in future, the real origin of goods in transit and not only the place where they came from. These measures seem to have been effective, since no other doubtful consignment through the port of Marseilles has been reported to the Sanctions Committee since then."

WHEAT

(91) Case No. 75 - Supply of wheat to Southern Rhodesia

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

Additional information received since the submission of the fourth report is given below.

A communication dated 13 December 1972 has been received from Australia, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Australia... has the honour to refer to the subject of sanctions against Rhodesia under Security Council resolution 253 (1968). The Secretary-General has been kept informed in the past of matters relating to the sale of wheat by Australia to Rhodesia. The Permanent Representative now wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the Australian Government is satisfied that humanitarian considerations no longer justify the export of wheat to Rhodesia. Accordingly, the Government has decided that it will no longer permit the export of wheat to Rhodesia from Australia."

New cases

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

By a letter dated 7 June 1972 the Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations reported information to the effect that the Government of Sweden had authorized a Swedish firm to export to Southern Rhodesia electro-medical equipment ordered by the University of Southern Rhodesia. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

"... The Swedish Government, on 5 May 1972, authorized the exportation to Rhodesia of electro-medical equipment to a value of Swedish Kroner 32.000. The name of the Swedish exporter is Elema-Schonander AB, Solna, and the goods have been ordered by the University of Rhodesia.

"The licence was granted as an exception to the general prohibition against trade with Rhodesia stipulated in the pertinent Swedish Law (No. 178:1971), which allows for exportation of medical equipment and equipment to be used for educational purposes. These exceptions are in line with the provisions in paragraph 3 of Security Council

resolution 253 (1968). I have, nevertheless, deemed it desirable to inform you of the above-mentioned transaction lest any misunderstanding should arise from it in the future."

At the Committee's request at its 102nd meeting, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 20 June 1972 to Sweden, requesting a complete description of the equipment in question and a detailed account of its intended use.

A reply dated 13 July 1972 has been received, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"Due to the industrial holiday season in Sweden it will not be possible to furnish the required information during the month of July. The Swedish Government hopes, however, to be in a position to forward the information during the month of August."

A further reply dated 8 September 1972 has been received from Sweden, the substantive part of which reads as follows:

"The Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations... has the honour to transmit herewith the requested information regarding the export from Sweden to Southern Rhodesia of electro-medical equipment.

"As will be seen from the documents enclosed the electro-medical equipment will be used solely for educational purposes in the new phonetics and linguistics laboratory at the University of Rhodesia. Therefore the export licence could be granted fully in accordance with the Royal Swedish Ordinance which corresponds to the content of paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).

"If the Committee would like to receive further information on this subject, the enterprise has expressed its willingness to furnish such information, e.g. in the case the export will actually take place."

(138) Case No. 136 - Import of sculptural objects from Southern Rhodesia:
Swedish letter dated 25 October 1972

By a letter dated 25 October 1972 the Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations reported information to the effect that the Government of Sweden had authorized the import into Sweden of 14 sculptures from Southern Rhodesia. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

"The Swedish Government on 13 October 1972 authorized the importation from Rhodesia of 14 sculptures. The name of the Swedish importer is Afro-Art, a non-profitmaking foundation established to promote art and handicraft production in developing countries of Africa and Asia.

"The licence to import the goods, worth Swedish Kroner 2,900, ^{19/} was granted as an exception to the general prohibition against trade with Rhodesia stipulated in the pertinent Swedish Law (No. 178:1971)

^{19/} The equivalent of approximately \$US 614.

in view of the following special circumstances pertaining in this case. The pieces of art in question which have been created and made by Africans, were purchased by Afro-Art already in 1967 and were exported from Rhodesia before the Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968. Since their exportation the goods have been stored in the Stockholm free port.

"According to its operative paragraph 3 it is trade with Rhodesia after the date of the resolution which is prohibited. As thus no mandatory ban was in force at the time of the purchase and export, the instance here under consideration is not in contravention of the sanctions but merely the final completion of an uncompleted transaction.

"I have deemed it desirable to inform you of the above-mentioned transaction with view of avoiding any misunderstanding that otherwise possibly could arise from it in the future."

ANNEX IV

NOTE ON TOBACCO TRANSACTIONS

At its 44th meeting held on 26 March 1971, the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), considered information contained in press reports to the effect that many tobacco buyers had arrived in Southern Rhodesia to attend secret sales of the 1971 tobacco crop. The Committee then decided to request the Secretary-General to bring that information urgently to the notice of all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies in order that they could all take the necessary measures, in conformity with the obligations contained in Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), to ensure that any requests for permits to import tobacco from the area concerned were subjected to careful scrutiny, and to draw their particular attention to paragraphs 31 to 40 of the Committee's third report to the Security Council (S/9844/Rev.1).

Accordingly on 31 March 1971 the Secretary-General transmitted notes to Governments of all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, drawing their attention to the points contained in the Committee's decision.

As of 16 February 1972, the Secretary-General has received 17 replies to his note of 31 March 1971. Five of those replies (El Salvador, Ghana, Italy, Mauritania and the United Kingdom) were simple acknowledgements; the substantive parts of the other 12 replies are given below.

ARGENTINA

/Original: Spanish/

/31 August 1971/

Following instructions from the Argentine Government, the Permanent Mission of the Argentine Republic wishes to inform the United Nations Secretariat that... the Ministry of Finance of the Argentine Republic has issued, through the National Customs Administration, internal circular No. 38/71, of which the relevant portion reads as follows:

"File No. 11.413/71 SH. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Worship has requested, in its note No. 6135/71, that precautions should be taken to prevent the entry into the country of tobacco of Southern Rhodesian origin, and at the same time to ensure careful scrutiny of documents covering tobacco imports from the area concerned in view of the possibility that Southern Rhodesian tobacco being exported disguised as of Mozambique or Malawi origin, with forged certificates of origin.

"To ensure more effective compliance with the aforesaid request, and in keeping with suggestions made by the United Nations Security Council, the Argentine customs - while continuing to refuse clearance to imports involving Southern Rhodesia as required by Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) - shall authorize the import of Malawi, Zambian or South African tobacco only when such shipments are accompanied by certificates issued by the Malawi Tobacco Control Commission, the Tobacco Industry Board of Zambia and the Central Cooperative Tobacco Co. of South Africa or the Western Province Co-operative Tobacco Growers' Company Ltd. of South Africa, and the import of Mozambique tobacco only when the shipments are accompanied by fumigation certificates (often issued at the port of shipment) which specify whether the tobacco was grown in the country where fumigation took place, in addition to the appropriate certificate of origin."

CANADA

/Original: English/

/5 April 1971/

The Permanent Representative would recall, in connexion with the press reports mentioned in the Secretary-General's note, that Canada is not traditionally an importer either of Malawi tobacco (see the note of the Chargé d'affaires of Canada to the Secretary-General of 25 February 1969) or of Mozambique tobacco (see the note of the Permanent Representative of Canada to the Secretary-General of 19 June 1970).

DAHOMÉY

/Original: French/

/11 May 1971/

The Republic of Dahomey maintains no diplomatic, economic, cultural or other relations with the Government of South Africa or with Southern Rhodesia.

In implementation of the various resolutions of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) on this subject, Dahomey has enacted a number of decrees boycotting these two States, and these decrees are still in force. They are:

No. 63-205/PR/MAE, dated 30 April 1963, for the application of various measures against South Africa;

No. 63-206/PR/MAE, dated 30 April 1963, concerning Portugal;

No. 15 bis/PR/MAE/AP, dated 12 January 1966, for the application of the decisions taken at the sixth regular session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU on Rhodesia.

INDIA

/Original: English/

/25 May 1971/

India is, at the present moment, not importing tobacco from any African States. Accordingly, there does not appear to be any danger of Rhodesian tobacco being imported into India disguised as originating from some other country.

IRAQ

/Original: English/

/2 April 1971/

Iraq does not import tobacco from Southern Rhodesia whatsoever, and the Government of the Republic of Iraq has firmly adhered to the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions in this respect.

KUWAIT

/Original: English/

/12 May 1971/

Kuwait does not import raw tobacco as it has no cigarette industry.

Moreover, the competent authorities in the State of Kuwait believe that the countries which export Rhodesian goods and issue forged certificates of origin to disguise the origin of those goods, are the ones immediately concerned. These countries should comply with United Nations resolutions and supervise the activities of private and official bodies within their jurisdiction, in order to make sure that false certificates are not issued to disguise the origin of goods exported from their territory.

LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC

/Original: English/

/14 May 1971/

Neither the Government of the Libyan Arab Republic nor its nationals entertain relations of any kind with Southern Rhodesia.

Tobacco is a governmental monopoly in Libya, and the tobacco imports come only from the United States of America, Canada, Turkey, Greece and India. The Government of the Libyan Arab Republic takes all the necessary measures in conformity with the obligations contained in Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970). At this present time, the Government of the Libyan Arab Republic has no information relevant to the secret sales of tobacco in Southern Rhodesia, but will certainly forward any that comes to attention.

LUXEMBOURG

/Original: French/

/24 May 1971/

According to the information available to the competent authorities in Luxembourg, tobacco imports by tobacco and cigarette manufacture in Luxembourg originate solely either in the United States or, in the case of oriental tobaccos, in Turkey, Romania, Greece and Bulgaria.

MADAGASCAR

/Original: French/

/15 July 1971/

The level of imports of leaf tobacco into Madagascar for the years 1969-1970, taken from the Customs statistics, is indicated below:

<u>1969</u>	<u>Country of origin</u>	<u>Tons (T)</u>	<u>Value (FMG)</u>
	Malawi.	389,280	79,022,300
	Turkey.	7,500	3,893,100
	Brazil.	15,019	3,808,800
	Paraguay.	100,764	18,855,400
	Cuba.	27,964	8,199,000
	Dominican Republic.	20,000	3,709,800
	Indonesia and Iran.	6,682	1,052,400
	Total	<u>561,209</u>	<u>118,540,800</u>
<u>1970</u>	South Africa.	45,359	8,681,700
	Malawi.	118,546	21,204,900
	United States	4,000	2,907,500
	Brazil.	96,735	17,079,600
	Paraguay.	292,123	46,455,600
	Total	<u>556,763</u>	<u>96,329,300</u>

NAURU

/Original: English/

/26 April 1971/

Tobacco in its raw state is not imported into the Republic and accordingly the Acting Secretary for External Affairs must advise the Secretary-General that the Republic is not in possession of relevant information of the type referred to in the Secretary-General's note.

SENEGAL

/Original: French/

/16 June 1971/

Tobacco may be imported into Senegalese territory only by entities which have obtained the consent of the competent foreign trade authorities. In 1970, only the firm Tabacs de l'Ouest Africain was granted, and used, two import licences for tobacco from Malawi.

Senegalese purchases for 1971 will be made only from countries in Europe: the United Kingdom, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania; the Americas: the United States, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay; and Asia: the Philippines, India, South Korea and China.

UPPER VOLTA

/Original: French/

/13 July 1971/

The Government of the Upper Volta has always considered it its duty to comply scrupulously with its commitments under the decisions of the Security Council, and in conformity with the Council's resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) all the necessary arrangements have been made to prevent the import of any goods originating in or shipped from Southern Rhodesia.

ANNEX V

NOTE PREPARED BY THE SECRETARIAT ON SOUTHERN RHODESIAN
TRADE FOR 1971 TOGETHER WITH STATISTICAL DATA

Southern Rhodesian exports

1. Southern Rhodesia's merchandise exports in 1971 amounted to \$388 million (compared with \$354 million in 1970), but no official information is available as to the direction and nature of these exports. The 74 countries whose import statistics are set out in the annex show that Southern Rhodesian exports to them were distributed as follows: Zambia \$US 29 million, Malawi \$16 million, Switzerland \$5 million, other countries (shown in appendix I) \$1 million, making a total of about \$52 million (compared with \$53 million in 1970). In addition to this recorded trade, it has been estimated that South Africa received Southern Rhodesian exports amounting to about \$90 million. It would appear, therefore, that some \$240 million of Southern Rhodesian exports have not been reflected in the corresponding 1971 import figures of world trade. This amount of exports appears to have reached world markets via Southern Rhodesia's neighbouring countries and to have been reflected in world trade as imports of the reporting countries from these neighbouring countries.

2. Evidence of the existence of these indirect exports is shown by a comparison of the imports of 23 important reporting countries 20/ from South Africa, Mozambique, Zambia and Malawi, with the corresponding exports of these four countries for the period 1965-1971. The results are shown in table I below:

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

Table I

Export trade of Southern Rhodesia's neighbouring
countries with 23 important countries

(in million US dollars)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
<u>South Africa</u>							
South African figures . . .	1,008	1,127	1,310	1,458	1,446	1,422	1,414
23 reporting countries' figures <u>a/</u>	1,060	1,210	1,401	1,589	1,668	1,674	1,640
Excess of imports over exports	52	83	91	131	222	252	226
<u>Mozambique</u>							
Mozambique figures	60	62	69	83	84	90	114
23 reporting countries' figures <u>a/</u>	81	81	120	137	124	150	141
Excess of imports over exports	21	19	51	54	40	60	27
<u>Zambia</u>							
Zambian figures	457	622	544	694	939	868	549
23 reporting countries' figures <u>a/</u>	410	518	510	618	866	879	520
Excess of imports over exports	47	-104	-34	-76	-73	11	-29
<u>Malawi</u>							
Malawian figures	26	33	40	27	28	37	46
23 reporting countries' figures <u>a/</u>	24	32	34	40	34	35	43
Excess of imports over exports	-2	-1	-6	13	6	-2	-3
<u>Total</u>							
Exporting countries' figures	1,551	1,844	1,963	2,262	2,497	2,417	2,101
23 reporting countries' figures <u>a/</u>	1,575	1,841	2,065	2,384	2,692	2,738	2,344
Excess of imports over exports	24	-3	102	122	195	321	221

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

3. It will be noted from the data shown above that in 1965 there was a discrepancy of \$73 million representing imports received from South Africa and Mozambique by the 23 reporting countries over and above the exports that these two countries declared to have sent. These imports were generally known as shipments dispatched overseas by exporters in South Africa and Mozambique, handling merchandise of the ex-Federation of Rhodesia, which were treated as goods in transit by them but were treated as imports from these two countries by the reporting countries. This explanation is substantiated in the table shown above by the excess of the declared exports in 1965 of Zambia and Malawi to the 23 reporting countries over the reported corresponding imports. This explanation also implies that in 1965 an amount of merchandise in this trade valued at \$24 million was of Southern Rhodesian origin. If this reasoning is accepted, it would mean that, during 1969-1971, exporters in South Africa and Mozambique were handling merchandise of Southern Rhodesia at a level of over \$200 million annually.

4. On the statistical evidence, it is possible to analyse Southern Rhodesian exports in 1965-1971 as follows:

Table II

Southern Rhodesian exports 1965-1971

(in million US dollars)

	<u>1965^{a/}</u>	<u>1966^{a/}</u>	<u>1967^{a/}</u>	<u>1968^{a/}</u>	<u>1969^{a/}</u>	<u>1970^{a/}</u>	<u>1971</u>
National exports (excluding gold) <u>a/</u>	399	238	238	234	297	346	379
to reporting countries <u>b/</u>	343	181	96	68	48	50	48
to South Africa <u>c/</u>	41	60	80	80	85	95	90
to non-reporting countries	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
to world markets via indirect trade	-	-3	62	86	64	201	241
Re-exports <u>a/</u>	43	24	17	12	10	8	9

a/ Southern Rhodesian figures. 1966-1970 figures were revised.

b/ 1966-1971: import data, mostly c.i.f., less 10 per cent allowances for freight, etc.

c/ 1966-1971: estimates derived from published data for South African imports from "Africa" less exports to South Africa reported by African countries.

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

Table III

Indirect exports of Southern Rhodesia

(in million US dollars)

	Excess of reported imports of 23 countries over exports of four neighbours of Southern Rhodesia	Indirect exports of Southern Rhodesia including re-exports	Difference
	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B)
1965	24	43	-19
1966	-3	21	-24
1967	102	79	23
1968	122	98	24
1969	195	174	21
1970	321	209	112
1971	221	250	-29

The substantial agreement shown above for the years 1967-1969 and 1971 and the exceptionally large figure for 1970 in column A indicates implicitly that during the period following United Nations sanctions, some \$700-800 million of Southern Rhodesia's exports reached world markets indirectly via South Africa and Mozambique.

Southern Rhodesian imports

6. Southern Rhodesia's imports in 1971 were \$395 million (compared with \$329 million in 1970). The 73 countries whose export statistics are set out in appendix II show that imports from them by Southern Rhodesia were distributed as follows: Australia, \$5 million; Malawi, \$5 million; Switzerland, \$3 million; United Kingdom, \$2 million; Federal Republic of Germany, \$2 million; other countries (also in appendix II) \$1 million, making a total of about \$18 million (compared with \$17 million in 1970). In addition to this recorded trade, it has been estimated that South Africa sent to Southern Rhodesia \$170 million worth of goods. It would appear, therefore, that some \$210 million of Southern Rhodesian imports have not been reflected in the corresponding 1971 export figures of world trade. The over-all situation of Southern Rhodesian imports for 1965-1971 is as follows:

Table IV

Southern Rhodesian imports 1965-1971
(in million US dollars)

	<u>1965^{a/}</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Imports ^{a/}	334	236	262	290	278	329	395
from reporting countries b/ . . .	253	79	63	44	15	16	17
from South Africa ^{c/}	78	110	135	150	155	160	170
unspecified origins	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
unaccounted for . .	-	47	64	96	108	153	208

a/ Southern Rhodesian figures.

b/ 1966-1971: exports to Southern Rhodesia reported by reporting countries.

c/ 1966-1971: estimates derived from published data for South African exports to "Africa" less imports from South Africa reported by African countries.

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

Table V

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

	<u>South Africa</u>	<u>Mozambique</u>	<u>Angola</u>
1965	2,461	173	195
1966	2,307	207	208
1967	2,690	199	275
1968	2,638	234	308
1969	2,983	260	323
1970	3,565	326	368
1971	4,039	335	422

Exports of specific commodities

Tobacco

8. The most important Southern Rhodesian export commodity was and probably still is tobacco, exports of which amounted to \$132 million in 1965. Normally, Southern Rhodesian exports of tobacco accounted for approximately 13 per cent of all world exports of unmanufactured tobacco and over 25 per cent of flue-cured tobacco. In 1971 Switzerland, which took \$1.2 million worth of tobacco (one thousand metric tons), appeared to be the only reporting country of significance.

9. It will be noted from the data in annex III of the previous report that the increases in tobacco imports of the reporting countries from the neighbouring countries of Southern Rhodesia during recent years over the level of the earlier periods are of magnitudes which called for investigation. For this reason, an analysis was made, in terms of quantities, of the imports of the reporting countries from the neighbours of Southern Rhodesia, namely, Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia, Angola and South Africa, compared with corresponding exports of these neighbouring countries by direction. The result of this analysis is shown in table VI below.

Table VI

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

(in thousand metric tons)

<u>Imports from</u>	<u>South Africa</u>	<u>Mozambique</u>	<u>Malawi and Zambia</u>	<u>Angola</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965	8.4	1.8	18.8 a/	2.0	31.1 a/
1966	7.4	2.1	16.1	2.1	27.8
1967	11.5	5.8	15.8	2.7	35.7
1968	13.5	7.0	17.1	3.4	41.0
1969	21.8	7.9	17.9	2.8	50.4
1970	24.2	10.8	14.6	2.7	52.3
1971	18.9	14.1	16.3	2.8	52.1
<u>Exports of</u>					
1965	7.6	0.8	12.7	2.3	23.4
1966	7.5	0.7	16.6	2.9	27.7
1967	9.0	1.1	12.8	2.6	25.6
1968	10.0	1.3	13.4	3.2	27.9
1969	12.8	1.1	13.1	1.6	28.6
1970	11.1	0.9	16.0	1.6	29.6
1971 b/	9.1	1.3	20.0	1.9	32.3

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

b/ Approximate estimates made on the basis of less than 12 months' information.

10. It will be noted from table VI that the imports for 1966 agreed with the corresponding exports. For 1965, the agreement was also good when account is taken of the fact that the reporting countries received 8,000 tons of tobacco from Zambia which were not reflected in the export statistics of Zambia (see foot-note a/ of table VI). However in 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971, the imports of the reporting countries from the neighbours of Southern Rhodesia exceeded the corresponding exports of these neighbours by 10.1, 13.1, 21.8, 22.7 and 19.8 thousand tons respectively. These amounts may represent Southern Rhodesian tobacco which was able to reach world markets through false declarations of origin.

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

Table VII

Tobacco situation in Southern Rhodesia
(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Imports of reporting countries:							
(a) directly from Southern Rhodesia	85.3	36.7	8.6	4.0	2.3	1.2	1.0
(b) via neighbouring countries	-	-	10.1	13.1	21.8	22.7	19.8
Recorded South African imports believed to be of Southern Rhodesian origin	1.7	11.3	9.1	3.9	3.7	8.9	6.0
TOTAL	87.0	48.0	27.8	21.0	27.8	32.8	26.8
Tobacco crop	111 ^{a/}	110	90	60	62	62	60
Southern Rhodesian exports	120.7 ^{b/}	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Tobacco estimated held in stock	-	62	62	39	34	29	32

a/ 9.7 thousand tons representing the short fall of the 1965 tobacco crop in meeting current export requirements were probably made good by Zambian tobacco (see foot-note a/ of table VI).

b/ Excess of Southern Rhodesian official exports of 120.7 thousand tons over the imports of 87 thousand tons is explained by: 20.4 thousand tons as stocks held in bond by importing countries and failures in recording as Southern Rhodesian tobacco on account of multilateral trade patterns; 8 thousand tons of Zambian tobacco as part of Southern Rhodesian exports; 5.5 thousand tons as exports to non-reporting countries.

12. In examining the data given above, it becomes apparent that during the five years 1967-1971, following the initiation of sanctions, approximately 40 per cent (137 thousand tons) of Southern Rhodesian tobacco crops reached world markets. However, a substantial amount of tobacco could have reached world markets in various clandestine ways that cannot be detected statistically. This possibility is revealed by the United Kingdom estimate of 126 thousand tons (or \$77 million US dollars) as being stock held by Southern Rhodesia at the end of 1968. According to the data set out in table VII, the corresponding stock figure should have been 163 thousand tons representing the tobacco accumulated during the period 1966-1968. If the United Kingdom estimate is correct, it would mean that an average of about 12 thousand tons of tobacco was being shipped out annually from Southern Rhodesia in addition to those recorded and inferred in table VII above. If, on the other hand, the tobacco stock in Southern Rhodesia at the end of 1970, 140 thousand tons, as revealed by the press in South Africa is to be considered realistic, then an average of 17 thousand tons of tobacco, instead of 12, was being shipped out annually in various clandestine ways that cannot be detected statistically.

Asbestos

13. Another important commodity is asbestos, Southern Rhodesian exports of which amounted to \$30 million in 1965. There were practically no imports from Southern Rhodesia by the reporting countries in 1969-1971. In 1968, the recorded imports of the reporting countries amounted to \$1.7 million (compared with \$24 million in the year 1965 and \$3.4 million in 1967). This amount was accounted for by the Federal Republic of Germany (\$1.2 million) and the United States (\$0.5 million). The United States explained its imports as shipments before 16 December 1966, the effective date of resolution 232 (1966). Similar to the case for Southern Rhodesian tobacco, there appear to be strong possibilities that Southern Rhodesia is sending asbestos to world markets via its neighbouring countries, chiefly South Africa. In these circumstances, an analysis was made (in terms of quantities) of the imports of the reporting countries from South Africa together with the corresponding exports of South Africa for the period 1965-1971. The results of the analysis are shown in table VIII below:

Table VIII

Trade in asbestos of South Africa with reporting countries
which took about 80 per cent of the asbestos exports of
Southern Rhodesia in 1965

(in thousand metric tons)

<u>Imports from South Africa of:</u>				<u>Exports of South Africa to:</u>		
	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Spain</u>	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Spain</u>
1965	202	26.3	16.6	207	27.1	10.9
1966	234	35.0 ^{a/}	20.2	214	27.4	13.2
1967	300	67.9	25.3	215	29.4	8.0
1968	317	65.2	30.5	233	33.4	10.0
1969	355	79.8	39.4	252	43.5	11.0
1970	356	94.0	43.7	258	63.5	11.6
1971	350	99.5	32.1	254	65.3	8.8

^{a/} Estimated on the basis of value data; the official quantity figure of 128.8 thousand metric tons appears to be a printing error.

14. It will be noted from table VIII above that, while the imports for 1965 agreed, by and large, with the corresponding exports, those for 1966 and 1967 exceeded the corresponding exports by 20 and 85 thousand tons respectively. For 1968 imports of the reporting countries exceeded South African exports by 84 thousand tons, for 1969 by 103 thousand tons, for 1970 by 98 thousand tons and for 1971 by 96 thousand tons. In view of the fact that the exports of South Africa are consistent with the amount of asbestos it produced, these excesses of imports may possibly be exports of Southern Rhodesian asbestos via South Africa. By incorporating this information with other elements relating to Southern Rhodesian exports, the over-all situation may be summarized as below:

Table IX

Asbestos situation in Southern Rhodesia

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Imports of reporting countries:							
(a) directly from Southern Rhodesia	114.6	53.7	14.8	6.7	-	0.2	-
(b) via South Africa	-	20.0	85.0	84.0	103.0	98.0	96.0
Recorded South African imports believed to be of Southern Rhodesian origin	8.6	11.2	14.0	13.1	15.4	17.2	11.8
Imports of reporting countries from Mozambique	3.0	3.7	2.7	3.9	5.1	5.5	4.1
Total exports sent to reporting countries	126.2 ^{a/}	88.6	116.5	107.7	123.5	120.9	111.9

^{a/} Corresponding exports reported by Southern Rhodesia as 131.2 thousand tons.

Chrome ore

15. The chief importer of Southern Rhodesia's chrome ore has been, traditionally, the United States, to which Southern Rhodesia sent \$5 million worth of chrome ore out of total exports of \$10.7 million in 1965. In 1967, the United States imported \$3.4 million worth of chrome ore which was explained by the authorities as goods shipped from Southern Rhodesia before 16 December 1966, and in 1968, imports of Southern Rhodesian chrome ore appear to have virtually ceased. In these circumstances, the possibility of Southern Rhodesian chrome ore being exported to the neighbouring countries was investigated. For this purpose an analysis was made (in terms of gross quantities) of the imports of the reporting countries from South Africa together with the corresponding exports of South Africa for the period 1964-1971. The results of the analysis are shown in table X below:

Table X

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

(in thousand metric tons gross)

	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>United States</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Western Europe</u>
Imports from South Africa				
1964	671	432	40	199
1965	715	437	52	222
1966	1,037	723	67	245
1967	822	433	183	206
1968	863	385	179	295
1969	1,082	363	246	466
1970	1,607	376	710	520
1971	1,598	370	720	508
Exports of South Africa				
1964	637	386	33	216
1965	776	396	109	264
1966	856	580	32	240
1967	656	292	111	246
1968	817	358	135	318
1969	908	369	154	379
1970	1,033	361	274	392
1971	1,210	377	355	473

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

Table XI

Chrome ore situation in Southern Rhodesia
(in thousand metric tons gross)

	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Imports of reporting countries:								
(a) directly from Southern Rhodesia	406	397	179	136	-	-	-	22
(b) via South Africa	-	-	181	166	46	174	574	388
Recorded South African imports believed to be of Southern Rhodesian origin	49	84	98	75	23	32	22	21
Imports of reporting countries from Mozambique	16	21	52	30	41	21	13	2
Total exports of Southern Rhodesia	471	502	510	407	110 ^{a/}	227 ^{a/}	612	433

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

Copper

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

18. In terms of quantities, the annual curtailment of Southern Rhodesian copper exports for 1966-1968 was gradual, namely from a level in 1965 of 18.4 thousand metric tons to 13.3 in 1966, 10.0 in 1967, 7.8 in 1968 and almost nil during 1969-1971. In view of the fact that both South Africa and Zambia are heavy exporters of copper and that both, in varying degrees, together with Southern Rhodesia use the transport facilities in Mozambique, it is very difficult to determine the true situation.

19. Other important commodities exported by Southern Rhodesia are meat and meat products, sugar, hides, skins and leather, iron ore and pig iron. Imports of these

commodities into the reporting countries from Southern Rhodesia in 1971 amounted to \$3 million (compared with \$48 million in the year 1965, \$2.4 million in the year 1969 and \$3 million in the year 1970). Because of the small magnitude of the trade involved in each commodity it is not possible to make a comprehensive analysis for each commodity. The difficulty lies in the fact that South Africa and some of the other neighbours are much more important exporters of most of these same commodities. As in the case of copper, it is possible for Southern Rhodesia to export at least some part of these commodities under false declarations, using its neighbours as the origin of these goods. In these circumstances, the inflation of the imports recorded by importing countries in comparison with the corresponding exports of Southern Rhodesia's neighbours would probably not be marked enough to draw any meaningful conclusion. In addition to the possibility described above, South Africa is understood, based on the statistical information relating to its over-all "imports from Africa", to be taking significant amounts of these commodities as imports. These imports are estimated to be at the level of \$2 million worth of meat products annually for 1967-1969, \$1 million of sugar, \$4-6 million of pig iron. Furthermore, it is conceivable that, on account of the heavy traffic of ocean transport via Mozambique and South Africa since the closure of the Suez Canal, demand on meats and other provisions in the form of ships' stores could have provided an important outlet for the produce of Southern Rhodesia. Indeed, available statistics regarding South African meat in the form of ships' stores registered important increases in recent periods. It is possible that Southern Rhodesia, whose produce is more competitive, may very well have benefited from the expansion of this market.

Maize

20. Southern Rhodesia normally produced a little over 800 thousand metric tons of maize mainly for domestic consumption. Its exports of this commodity were insignificant. In fact it was necessary to import a small amount (23 thousand tons in 1965) to supplement the locally produced maize for domestic consumption. However, as a result of the régime's attempt to encourage agricultural diversification to compensate for the reduction in tobacco exports due to sanctions, there has been a substantial increase in the acreage under maize. According to the most recent information, Southern Rhodesia produced the following quantities of maize during the period 1965-1971:

Table XII

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

<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
822	952	1,000	950	1,020	700	900

21. If the annual domestic requirement were of a magnitude of 800-850 thousand tons, the production data shown above would imply that, prior to the year 1970 when Southern Rhodesia harvested a poor crop because of adverse seasonal factors, there should be 500-700 thousand tons available for export. This amount may indeed have reached world markets via Mozambique as explained in the following paragraphs.

22. Mozambique normally produced about 400 thousand tons of maize also mainly for domestic consumption. It also imported a small amount to supplement its locally produced maize. Table XIII below described the situation of maize in Mozambique for the period 1965-1970 (data for 1971 are not available at present).

Table XIII

Production, trade and apparent consumption
of maize in Mozambique

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>
Production	390	440	500	560	500	450
Imports	43	7	-	-	-	35
Exports	-	-	25	122	25	12
Apparent consumption	433	447	475	438	475	473

23. It will be noted from the data shown above that Mozambique also managed to increase its production of maize during the period 1967-1969 when it was able to export a moderate amount each year. However, a detailed study of import data published by maize-importing countries revealed that a far larger amount of maize had been imported from Mozambique during the same period as shown in table XIV below:

Table XIV

Imports of maize from Mozambique

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Reporting countries							
Belgium-Luxembourg	Nil	Nil	42	32	-	-	-
Egypt	Nil	Nil	105	93	14	-	N.A.
France	Nil	Nil	20	11	-	-	-
Germany (Federal Republic of)	Nil	Nil	99	59	-	-	15
Italy	Nil	Nil	26	40	-	-	-
Japan	Nil	30	145	184	149	21	10
Netherlands	Nil	Nil	6	12	-	-	-
Portugal	Nil	Nil	15	78	25	16	0
Switzerland	Nil	Nil	-	-	-	-	2
<u>Total</u>	Nil	30	458	509	188	37	27

24. As may be seen from the data shown above, maize-importing countries received 1,155 thousand tons of maize from Mozambique during the period 1967-1969 as compared with the export data of Mozambique of 177 thousand tons for the same period shown in Table XIII. The difference of 978 thousand tons, or at least a major portion of it, could very well be maize of Southern Rhodesian origin.

Table XV

South Africa's production and trade in maize

(in thousand metric tons)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Production ^{a/}	4,393	4,907	9,299	5,316	5,339	6,133	8,545
Exports:							
calendar year	326	46	2,001	2,949	760	1,201	1,466
12 months							
December-November ^{b/}	345	59	1,667	3,078	911	1,207	1,252
Derived exports ^{c/}	325	58	1,477	3,023	1,031	1,371	1,165

a/ Excluding non-commercial production in villages.

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

c/ Imports from South Africa by reporting countries.

25. Substantial agreement is also revealed by study of the trade in maize of Angola and Malawi.

26. Exports of the reporting countries to Southern Rhodesia of the four commodity groups specified in resolution 232 (1966), paragraph 2 (d) to (f), namely motor vehicles and their parts, petroleum products, crude petroleum, and aircraft and their parts amounted to approximately \$0.1 million in 1971 (compared with \$36 million in the year 1965, \$1.2 million in the year 1967 and \$0.1 million in the year 1970).

Imports of specific commodities

Motor vehicles and their spare parts

27. Among the four commodity groups, motor vehicles and their parts is the most important group. In 1971 the reporting countries' exports of these commodities to Southern Rhodesia was almost nil (compared with \$34 million in the year 1965), \$6.1 million in the year 1966, \$1 million in the year 1967.

28. There appears to be a strong possibility that Southern Rhodesia may be receiving motor vehicles and their parts through neighbouring countries. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that Southern Rhodesia is maintaining its exporting pattern of this commodity group to its neighbouring countries. Malawi, for instance, reported annual imports of \$0.5 million from Southern Rhodesia of motor vehicles and their parts during 1967-1968 (compared with \$1.3 million in 1965). For this reason, an analysis was made (in terms of value) ^{21/} of the exports of the reporting countries to South Africa and also to Mozambique, Angola, Malawi and Zambia together with the corresponding imports by the above-mentioned countries from the reporting countries. The results of the analysis are shown in tables XVI and XVII below.

Table XVI

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

(in million US dollars)

	<u>All reporting countries</u>	<u>U.K.</u>	<u>Germany (Federal Republic of)</u>	<u>United States</u>	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>France</u>	<u>Italy</u>	<u>Australia</u>
Exports to South Africa									
1965	289	128	56	38	25	16	9	8	5
1966	288	120	60	43	23	16	10	8	6
1967	310	112	67	54	17	27	12	11	7
1968	331	96	84	50	20	30	17	11	13
1969	444	121	106	67	16	63	19	16	28
1970	537	145	36	55	20	73	33	23	41
1971	600	176	122	51	13	126	37	26	40 ^{a/}
Imports of South Africa									
1965	289	130	55	38	21	18	9	9	5
1966	273	111	56	44	21	15	10	8	5
1967	305	104	64	55	20	27	11	11	7
1968	318	93	79	51	18	29	13	12	14
1969	411	106	96	71	13	60	15	17	26
1970	496	127	122	65	18	70	20	20	43
1971	575	157	127	61	15	117	24	22	42

^{a/} Estimated figure.

^{21/} It is not possible to make a comprehensive study in terms of quantities because of the heterogeneous nature of this group of commodities. Countries use different units of quantity to express the physical volume of imports and exports.

Table XVII

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

(in million US dollars)

	<u>Exports of reporting countries to Mozambique, Angola, Malawi and Zambia</u>	<u>Imports of Mozambique, Angola, Malawi and Zambia from reporting countries</u>
1965	48	49
1966	73	62
1967	90	84
1968	104	94
1969	95	86
1970	121	95
1971	138	109 ^{a/}

a/ Estimated figure.

29. It may be noted from the tables above that in the year 1965 exports agree well with the corresponding imports. However, in the years 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971 exports by the reporting countries to South Africa and to the four countries of Angola, Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia exceeded the corresponding imports reported by those five countries as follows (in million US dollars):

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
South Africa	15	5	13	33	41	25
The four countries	11	6	10	9	26	29
TOTAL	26	11	23	42	67	54

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

Table XVIII

South African exports of motor vehicles and their parts

(in million US dollars)

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Total exports ^{a/}	12.2	17.3	22.0	24.4	20.0	20.4	24.0
(of which re-exports) ^{a/}	(4.7)	(7.3)	(10.5)	(16.1)	(13.4)	(13.5)	(16.3)
to reporting countries ^{a/}	1.8	2.1	3.3	3.4	4.2	1.6	2.9
to neighbouring countries other than Southern Rhodesia ^{b/}	4.4	5.4	5.1	3.4	3.8	2.9	3.0 ^{c/}
to Southern Rhodesia	2.2 ^{d/}	6.0 ^{c/}	13.6	17.6	12.0	15.9	18.1
Unknown destination	3.8	3.8					

a/ South African figures.

b/ Reported by partner countries.

c/ Estimated.

d/ Reported by Southern Rhodesia.

31. There is evidence of a substantial discrepancy between the export figures and the import figures. This, together with the increase in recorded South African imports and the high level of estimated South African exports to Southern Rhodesia leads to the conclusion that motor vehicles are reaching Southern Rhodesia, mainly through South Africa, in breach of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), at a level possibly well above the normal level of Southern Rhodesia's imports during the periods prior to the United Nations sanctions.

32. As to petroleum supplies to Southern Rhodesia, no meaningful evaluation of the situation is possible from the data reported by the reporting countries listed in annex III to the previous report. It is known that, following the closure of the only Southern Rhodesian Refinery at Umtali in January 1966, no imports of crude petroleum were required. Iran, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia were normal major suppliers of petroleum products, not only to Southern Rhodesia but also to South Africa, Mozambique and Angola. However, there is indication that major sources of supply of these commodities to Southern Rhodesia were shifted to South Africa in the period 1966-1971. Based on available statistics, it is estimated that between \$60-70 million worth of fuel was exported by South Africa to Southern Rhodesia in these five years. The remainder of Southern Rhodesia's normal requirement of about \$80-100 million was most likely supplied by South Africa, but presumably without statistical recording in the regular trade statistics as suggested in paragraph 6 above.

33. In evaluating the import pattern of Southern Rhodesian trade for the periods following the application of economic sanctions, it is not possible to give a commodity analysis as comprehensive as in the case for its export pattern for the reason that Southern Rhodesia's exports are concentrated in a few primary commodities while its imports are much more diversified. For instance, the export commodities discussed in this note accounted for 59 per cent of the total Southern Rhodesian exports in 1965 while the four imports commodities discussed in the preceding paragraphs accounted for only 16 per cent of total Southern Rhodesian imports in 1965.

Appendix I

Imports of all commodities from Southern Rhodesia*
(as reported by countries listed)

(in thousand US dollars)

<u>Importing country</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
United States	14,056 ^{a/}	9,359	6,463	1,599	68	115	807
Canada	3,152	1,087	4	2	1	1	2
Argentina	377	62	10	-	-	-	-
Brazil	55 ^{a/}	62	100	-	-	-	-
Chile	4 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colombia	185	230	-	-	-	-	-
Mexico	2 ^{a/}	-	-	1 ^{a/}	-	-	-
Belgium-Luxembourg	2,806	3,540	1,998	829	477	142	96
France	2,873	1,856	1,059	1,171	50	61	130
Germany (Federal Republic of)	35,112	30,525	15,966	13,298	1,120	572	485
Italy	16,666	8,554	259	138	27	59	2
Netherlands	5,987	5,722	2,406	542	136	21	2
United Kingdom	83,711	12,809	405	215	163	117	129
Denmark	1,244	1,205	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	1,713	664	18	-	-	1	-
Sweden	1,960	182	-	-	-	-	-
Austria	4,436	1,673	249	95	26	-	-
Portugal	2,927 ^{a/}	2,148	5,635	3,582 ^{b/}
Switzerland ^{c/}	5,678	4,155	3,925 ^{d/}	3,483 ^{d/}	3,625 ^{d/}	4,296 ^{d/}	4,511 ^{d/}
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ireland	967	142	70	32	4	-	-
Greece	2,581 ^{a/}	5,644 ^{a/}	677 ^{a/e/} 4 ^{f/}	-	-	-	10
Turkey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	3,543	2,288	156	-	-	-	-
Finland	845	290	3	1	-	-	-
Yugoslavia	677 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Exports to these countries accounted for approximately 86 per cent of the total exports of Southern Rhodesia in 1965.

Appendix I (continued)

<u>Importing country</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Jordan	-	470	201	20	11
Cyprus	398	260	2	2	1	1	1
Libya	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
Israel	82 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	...
Iran	244 ^{a/}	156	129
Lebanon	-	-	-
Egypt	1,241	189	1	12	94	-	...
Ethiopia	15	149	-	-
Australia	3,266	787	60	74	1	1	...
New Zealand	1,178	999	4	1	-	-	...
Botswana	5,432	...	826 ^{g/}
Uganda	561	25	-
Ghana	297	3	-	-	-
Mauritius	242	8	-	-	-	-	...
Nigeria	1,017 ^{a/}	507 ^{a/}	9	-	-
Zambia	99,507	64,904	45,029	31,602	30,481	32,473	29,429
Malawi	20,805	17,267	14,732	12,588	12,534	15,505	15,896 ^{h/}
Ivory Coast	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Senegal	-	1	-	-	-	-	...
Angola	612 ^{a/}	689	1,137	374 ^{i/}
Mozambique	2,991	5,862	4,458
Liberia	5	9	9	-
Tunisia	236 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	...
Japan	26,497	13,781	1,266	822	-	-	20
Ceylon	87	79	2	-
India	6,503	166	1	-	-	-	...
Pakistan	291 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	...
Malaysia, West	3,569 ^{a/}	1,123	5	-	-	-	-
Singapore	2,109 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	...
Sarawak	11 ^{a/}	2 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Sabah	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Hong Kong	2,313	2,082	22	-	-	-	-
Cambodia	88 ^{a/}	-	-	-

Appendix I (continued)

<u>Importing country</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Laos	-	-	-	-	-
Viet-Nam, Republic of	-	-	-	78 ^{a/}	-
Indonesia	-	-	-
Korea, Republic of .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	124 ^{a/}	335 ^{a/}	58 ^{a/}	-	-
Thailand	-	-	-	-	-
Jamaica	566 ^{a/}	456	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago .	389	360	8	-	-	-	...
Barbados	22	-	-	-	-
Guyana	168	127	4	-
Netherlands Antilles	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Fiji	222	125	38	-	<u>g/</u>	<u>b/</u>	...
Western Samoa	-	-	-	-	-
Malta	217	88	1	2	-	-	-

a/ Refers to trade with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

b/ January-June.

c/ See the official declaration of the Swiss Government contained in annex II to document S/7781 of 21 February 1967.

d/ "The Swiss importer is authorized to make use of his yearly quota any time of the year, e.g., in the early months of the year 1967. The quotas are compounded on the basis of the average import quantity of the commodity during the previous three years. Fluctuations are furthermore possible between the years, as the use of a yearly quota requested in December may only appear in the trade statistics of the first three months of the following year, the reason being that the import licences granted within the quota are generally valid for three months."

e/ January-February.

f/ March-December.

g/ January-September.

h/ 1971 figure has been recorded on a c.i.f. basis.

i/ January-May.

Appendix II

Exports of all commodities to Southern Rhodesia*
(as reported by countries listed)

(in thousand US dollars)

<u>Exporting country</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
United States	22,982 ^{a/}	7,491	3,757	2,024	455	514	652
Canada	3,625	575	89	22	2	16	-
Argentina	1	-	-	-	-	-	...
Brazil	86 ^{a/}	20	24	13	4	-	...
Chile	2 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-
Colombia	2	-	-	-	-
Mexico	207 ^{a/}	40 ^{a/}	103 ^{a/}	58 ^{a/}	6 ^{a/}
Belgium-Luxembourg	6,832	3,444	1,922	1,312	139	82	42
France	3,850	4,246	3,976	2,380	200	286	337
Germany (Federal Republic of)	10,903	11,186	12,305	12,914	1,234	1,176	1,552
Italy	6,318	5,010	1,339	1,295	73	63	21
Netherlands	7,291	5,748	4,699	3,000	57	278	255
United Kingdom	88,808	7,648	2,877	1,946	1,958	1,206	1,698
Denmark	667	31	37	29	29	31	19
Norway	1,527	760	183	1	1	-	1
Sweden	3,413	51	1	-	2	-	-
Austria	800	1,256	1,252	1,082	87	-	-
Portugal	559 ^{a/}	1,055	1,824	878 ^{b/}
Switzerland ^{c/}	1,641	1,890	1,939	2,513	1,540	1,969	2,851
Iceland	-	-	1 ^{a/}	1 ^{a/}	-	-	-
Ireland	37	9	31	4	-	-	-
Greece	63 ^{a/}	19 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-
Turkey	2 ^{a/}	-	-	2	-	-	-
Spain	193	31	-	-	-	-	-
Finland	492	14	1	-	-	-	-
Yugoslavia	16 ^{a/}	81 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-

* Imports from these countries accounted for approximately 75 per cent of the total imports of Southern Rhodesia in 1965.

Appendix II (continued)

<u>Exporting country</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Jordan	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	5	3	4	1	1	1	1
Libya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Israel	1,482 ^{a/}	-	-	-	5	-	-
Iran	2,821 ^{a/}	3	-
Lebanon	-	-	-
Egypt	1	-	-	-	-	-	...
Ethiopia	-	-	<u>d/</u>
Australia	4,510	4,072	5,653	5,851	3,539	4,937	4,840
New Zealand	237 ^{e/}	37 ^{e/}	7	12 ^{e/}	18 ^{e/}	-	-
Uganda	412	-	-
Ghana	17	-	2	-	-	-	...
Mauritius	6	-	-	-	-	-	...
Nigeria	129 ^{a/}	1,823 ^{a/}	6	-	-	...	-
Zambia	15,317	7,018	2,850	1,332	613	1,032	470
Malawi	4,359	2,951	2,735	2,872	3,804	5,148	5,315
Ivory Coast	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Senegal	309 ^{a/}	122	-	-	-	-	...
Angola	304 ^{a/}	154	214	65 ^{f/}
Mozambique	3,247	2,698	3,818
Liberia	-	-	-	3
Tunisia	15 ^{a/}	26 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	...
Japan	16,684	11,110	13,597	4,525	4	4	6
Ceylon	288	-	-	-
India	4,526	16	-	-	-	-	-
Pakistan	448 ^{a/}	-	-	-	<u>g/</u>	-	...
Malaysia, West	618 ^{a/}	12	-	-	-	-	-
Singapore	1,217 ^{a/}	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sarawak	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sabah	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Hong Kong	1,328	318	139	2	-	-	-
Cambodia	-	-	-	-
Laos	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix II (continued)

<u>Exporting country</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Viet-Nam, Republic of	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Indonesia	-	...	-
Korea, Republic of	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Philippines	2 ^{a/}	26 ^{a/}	3 ^{a/}	-	-	-	...
Thailand	-	-	-	-	-
Jamaica	2 ^{a/}	-	-	<u>d/</u>
Trinidad and Tobago	7	4	8	-	-	-	...
Barbados	-	-	-	-	-
Guyana	-	-	-	-
Netherlands Antilles	-	-	1	-	-	-	...
Fiji	-	-	-	-	<u>h/</u>	<u>b/</u>	...
Western Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	...
Malta	9	5	7	3	-	-	-

a/ Refers to trade with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

b/ January-June.

c/ See the official declaration of the Swiss Government contained in annex II to document S/7781 of 21 February 1967.

d/ January-March.

e/ Domestic exports.

f/ January-May.

g/ July-December.

h/ January-September.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организация Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах по всем районам мира. Приводите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
