

34 978  
S

UNITED NATIONS  
SECURITY  
COUNCIL



Distr. 8848  
GENERAL  
S/9844  
15 June 1970  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

THIRD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED IN PURSUANCE OF  
SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 253 (1968) OF 29 MAY 1968

Letter of transmittal

15 June 1970

Sir,

I have the honour to transmit herewith the third report of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), of 29 May 1968.

Accept, Sir, the assurance of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Padma Bahadur KHATRI  
Chairman

His Excellency  
The President of the Security Council

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1 - 6	3
II. WORK OF THE COMMITTEE . . . . .	7 - 10	5
III. REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 253 (1968) . . . . .	11 - 15	7
IV. TRADE OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA . . . . .	16 - 43	9
V. CONSULAR AND TRADE REPRESENTATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA	44 - 46	16
VI. AIRLINES OPERATING TO AND FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA . . .	47 - 50	17
VII. IMMIGRATION AND TOURISM . . . . .	51 - 56	18
VIII. SUSPECTED VIOLATIONS OF SANCTIONS . . . . .	57 - 94	20
IX. FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE . . . . .	95 - 98	30
X. OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	99 - 107	33

ANNEXES

- Annexes I-II     [see document S/9844/Add.1]  
Annexes III-VII   [see document S/9844/Add.2]

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The first and second reports dated 30 December 1968<sup>1/</sup> and 12 June 1969<sup>2/</sup> respectively, of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) were included in the agenda of the Security Council when it considered the situation in Southern Rhodesia at its 1475th to 1481st meetings from 13 to 24 June 1969.
2. Following its consideration, in March 1970, of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the Security Council adopted resolution 277 (1970) which contained extended terms of reference for the Committee (see section IX, paras. 96 and 97).
3. This, the third report of the Committee, covers the work of the Committee since the submission of its second report dated 12 June 1969.
4. In accordance with the Committee's decision<sup>3/</sup> that its Chairmanship should rotate every two months in the English alphabetical order, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was Chairman during June and July; the representative of the United Kingdom during August and September; the representative of the United States during October and November; and the representative of Algeria during December 1969.
5. Following the expiry, on 31 December 1969, of the terms of office of Algeria, Pakistan and Paraguay as members of the Security Council, consultations were held on the question of the membership of the Committee. In the course of the consultations, certain suggestions were made concerning the possibility of an enlargement of the Committee. On 10 April 1970, the President of the Security Council announced<sup>4/</sup> that, until further decision, and without prejudice to the position of those members of the Security Council who favoured an enlargement, the Committee would be composed of France, Nepal, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States. The President, in his announcement, stated further that it had been agreed that the Committee should continue its work and prepare its report to the Security Council by the end of May and that, after the report had been issued, the question of an enlargement of the Committee would be taken up for further consideration.

---

<sup>1/</sup> S/8954.

<sup>2/</sup> S/9252 and Add.1

<sup>3/</sup> S/9252, para. 3.

<sup>4/</sup> S/9748.

6. In accordance with the decision referred to in paragraph 4 above, as from January 1970, the representatives of France and Nepal acted successively as Chairman of the Committee. At the 30th meeting of the Committee on 21 May 1970, on the proposal of the representative of Nicaragua, the Committee unanimously agreed that the representative of Nepal should continue as Chairman until the end of June.

## II. WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

7. During the period covered by the present report, the Committee continued its work, in pursuance of the tasks assigned to it by the Security Council, along the lines indicated in its second report,<sup>1/</sup> and dealt with the following matters:

- (a) Examined the reports on the implementation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) submitted by the Secretary-General;
- (b) Considered the information provided by States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies in response to requests by the Committee made through the Secretary-General (the texts of which were reproduced in the second report) concerning:
  - (i) Trade of Southern Rhodesia;
  - (ii) Southern Rhodesian tobacco held in bond in various countries;
  - (iii) Tobacco exported from Mozambique;
  - (iv) Southern Rhodesian tobacco exported as Malawi tobacco under forged certificates of origin;
  - (v) Television material;
  - (vi) Consular and trade representation in Southern Rhodesia;
  - (vii) Airlines operating to and from Southern Rhodesia.
- (c) Considered the detailed trade statistics of Southern Rhodesia for the first half of 1969, together with an analysis thereof prepared by the Secretariat, as well as a note submitted by the United Kingdom containing its assessment of the effects of sanctions on the Southern Rhodesian economy,
- (d) Devoted considerable attention to investigating a number of specific cases of suspected violations of the sanctions decided upon in Security Council resolution 253 (1968), brought to its attention by States;
- (e) Considered other relevant information received from States concerning actions taken by them on violations of sanctions and other related matters.

8. The Committee also considered the difficulty faced by Governments of determining the true origin of goods suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin, but claimed to originate elsewhere by the commercial companies or agents who seek to import them. The Committee noted that some of the documents currently

---

<sup>1/</sup> S/9252, para. 6.

produced by such importers in support of their claim may amount to no more than declarations by directly interested parties made before non-official bodies, such as Chambers of Commerce. On 2 September 1969, it approved a memorandum on the application of sanctions indicating some points which the customs authorities of importing countries might bear in mind in the investigation of the origin of suspected goods. At the request of the Committee, the memorandum was transmitted by the Secretary-General to States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies by a note verbale dated 18 September 1969. The text of the memorandum is reproduced in annex VI.<sup>2/</sup>

9. The Committee also considered a number of proposals concerning organization of its future work, taking into account also the provisions of Security Council resolution 277 (1970).

10. A detailed account of the Committee's work concerning the matters referred to above is given in sections III to VIII which follow. Section IX of the present report contains the Committee's decisions with regard to its future work and section X contains its observations and recommendations.

---

<sup>2/</sup> S/9844/Add.2, annex VI.

III. REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE IMPLEMENTATION  
OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 253 (1968)

11. In its second report, the Committee stated that, as of 6 June 1969, ninety-seven States Members of the United Nations and five members of the specialized agencies had reported to the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 253 (1968).<sup>1/</sup>

12. Since then, seven additional communications have been received from States Members of the United Nations concerning the implementation of resolution 253 (1968). Substantive parts of these replies are reproduced in the additional reports of the Secretary-General contained in documents S/8786/Add.10 and Add.11. Five of the seven communications are from States which had previously reported and contained details of measures taken or texts of legislation enacted for the implementation of the provisions of resolution 253 (1968). The reply from one of the two States, which had not reported previously, stated that it had already taken measures to terminate all relations with Southern Rhodesia. The reply from the other State contained the text of a Cabinet Decree "establishing further restrictions on trade with Southern Rhodesia" in implementation of resolution 253 (1968).

13. In this connexion, the Committee wishes to recall the following observations which it made in its second report to the Security Council:<sup>2/</sup>

"The great majority of States which replied reported that they are complying with the provisions of the resolution. A number of them stated in their replies that they do not recognize the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and have no relations of any kind with it. Some States have not found it necessary to take any specific measures. Some others stated that they have already taken or are taking necessary measures for the implementation of the resolution. Several States gave details of the measures taken or submitted texts of relevant legislation or orders. In taking measures for the implementation of the resolution, some States have made a distinction between mandatory and other provisions.

"Four States, Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Malawi, and Zambia, pointed out the adverse effect on their economies of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

---

<sup>1/</sup> S/8786 and Add.1-9 and S/9252, paras. 7-14.

<sup>2/</sup> S/9252, paras. 9 to 13.

"Portugal stated in its reply that 'since the Security Council is unable or unwilling to make clear its position with regard to the points which have given rise to concern on the part of the Portuguese Government it is difficult to see how Portugal can be asked to take a position on problems and questions which the Council refuses to consider'.

"Switzerland, which is not a Member State of the United Nations but a member of the specialized agencies, stated in its reply that 'for reasons of principle, Switzerland, a neutral State, cannot submit to the mandatory sanctions of the United Nations.' However, 'independently and without recognizing any legal obligation to do so, it has taken steps to ensure that any possibility of increasing Rhodesian trade is excluded and that the United Nations sanctions policy cannot be contravened.'"

14. Thirty-one States, twenty-seven Members of the United Nations and four members of the specialized agencies, have not so far replied to any of the communications of the Secretary-General requesting information on measures taken to implement Security Council resolution 253 (1968).
15. Members of the United Nations, which have not replied, include South Africa, whose defiant attitude has been drawn to the attention of the Security Council in the Committee's first and second reports. In this connexion, the Committee also wishes to point out that, although Portugal has formally replied to the Secretary-General's communication, the reply amounts to a statement of its unwillingness to comply with the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

#### IV. TRADE OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA

1. Consideration of trade of Southern Rhodesia on the basis of statistical data

16. The Committee examined the information made available to it on the foreign trade of Southern Rhodesia. In addition to data provided by Governments on their own trade, the Committee had before it a note dated 9 January 1970 prepared by the Secretariat on Southern Rhodesian trade for 1968 and the first half of 1969, together with statistical data.<sup>1/</sup>

17. It had also received a note dated 2 June 1970 from the United Kingdom Government on the effects of sanctions on the economy of Southern Rhodesia since the illegal declaration of independence, and the outlook for 1970.<sup>2/</sup> The Committee also had available to it certain reports for the year 1969 published by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

18. The Committee was not in a position to analyse fully the developments concerning the trade of Southern Rhodesia in 1969, as the data from the Secretariat was not yet complete. However, in order not to delay the report, the Committee decided to proceed with its preparation without waiting for the trade statistics for the full year of 1969 which, when available, would be transmitted to the Security Council as a supplement to the present report.

19. As may be seen from the data reported below and in the relevant annexes, it is becoming increasingly difficult to determine precisely the magnitude and direction of Southern Rhodesia's foreign trade. Concerning the magnitude of the trade, the data transmitted by Member States in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) fall far short of the total amount of trade as released by the Salisbury régime. As to the direction of the trade, following the suppression of this type of information by the illegal régime, it can only be partly evaluated from information published by other States.

---

1/ S/9844/Add.1, annex I.

2/ S/9844/Add.1, annex II.

20. According to the Secretariat note (referred to in paragraph 16), Southern Rhodesia's export trade in 1968 was practically unchanged from the level of 1967 at a figure of \$256 million. This was 42 per cent below the level of 1965 which was the last normal year before the illegal declaration of independence. It was estimated that the exports were distributed as follows: to South Africa \$80 million; to other countries, as disclosed by recorded trade statistics, which include Southern Rhodesia's trading partners, \$75 million, and to world markets not recorded by the trade statistics and probably under false certificates of origin, \$100 million.

21. Southern Rhodesia's imports in 1968 amounted to \$290 million, which was an increase of slightly more than 10 per cent over 1967, but a decrease of 13 per cent compared with 1965. These imports were composed of \$44 million traced in international trade statistics, while the remainder, which does not figure in recorded statistics, was imported from or through neighbouring countries.

22. For the period January-June 1969, the data made available to the Secretary-General by the reporting countries showed imports into those countries from Southern Rhodesia of \$25 million, and exports from those countries to Southern Rhodesia of \$8 million.

23. It is clear that much of the trade with Southern Rhodesia is now being reported in the statistics as trade with South Africa and Mozambique. There may also be some trade being reported in the statistics as trade with other neighbouring countries. Accordingly, the data set out in annex I<sup>3/</sup> show substantial increases in the imports into certain countries of tobacco, asbestos, chrome ore, copper and maize which are attributed to neighbouring countries of Southern Rhodesia but which, pending further investigation, indicate possible evasions of sanctions. There also appears to be a strong possibility that Southern Rhodesia is receiving motor vehicles and their parts through neighbouring countries.

24. The United Kingdom note, inter alia, stated that Rhodesia's exports were \$US282 million in 1967, and \$US237 million in 1968. In 1969, however, Rhodesian exports rose to \$US336 million, i.e., about 70 per cent of the 1965 level. It

was estimated that, in 1969 as in 1968, some \$US126 million went to countries outside Africa whose Governments are applying sanctions, presumably under false declarations of origin.

25. As for the imports which had been cut back from \$US335 million in 1965 to \$US237 million in 1966, they had been allowed to rise to \$US262 million in 1967 and \$US290 million in 1968; in 1969, however, they were reduced to \$US278 million. As a whole, although the visible trade balance was converted from a deficient of \$US26 million in 1968 to a surplus of \$US50 million in 1969, a persistent deficit of \$US50 million on invisible account reduced the current account surplus to \$US0.42 million.

2. Replies received from Governments for the period ending June 1969

26. The Committee, in its second report,<sup>4/</sup> stated that, at its request, the Secretary-General had sent a note verbale dated 17 February 1969 to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, requesting their comments on a note by the Secretariat on the trade of Southern Rhodesia for 1967 and the first half of 1968, particularly in cases in which there was evidence of possible violations of sanctions.

27. The majority of the Governments which replied stated that they were fully implementing the provisions of the Security Council resolutions or that they had no comments.

28. The Federal Republic of Germany stated that its foreign trade with Southern Rhodesia had sharply declined since October 1968 when it had taken legislative and administrative measures in implementation of resolution 253 (1968).

29. Denmark stated that following the winding up of deliveries in accordance with contracts entered into before the entry into force of the prohibition of exportation of all goods from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia, i.e., 7 December 1965, no import had taken place into Denmark of such goods, nor had any export taken place from Denmark to Southern Rhodesia, apart from very limited supplies of pharmaceutical products and hospital equipment. Limited export of such had been subject to authorization by the Danish authorities in each separate case.

---

<sup>4/</sup> S/9252, paragraphs 15 and 16.

30. The United Kingdom stated that it appeared that trade figures drawn from the published trade returns of Rhodesia's trading partners only covered about one fifth of the total trade and could not be relied upon for a number of reasons. It was therefore most important to concentrate attention on the need for countries which had professed their intention of implementing the provisions of resolution 253 (1968) to close the gaps through which so much trade with Rhodesia had continued to take place.

3. Trade in tobacco

31. In their replies to the note verbale of 17 February 1969 (see paragraph 26 above), some Governments referred specifically to tobacco trade, as follows:

(a) Cyprus stated that importation of tobacco in 1966 had covered shipments prior to the publication of the relevant prohibition order in the Government Gazette.

(b) The Netherlands stated that the imports of Southern Rhodesian tobacco were from stocks exported prior to 16 December 1966 and held in bond by Netherlands importers and tobacco manufacturers in various ports outside Southern Rhodesia. It added that these stocks amounted to about 212 tons on 23 April 1969 and would not be exhausted before the end of 1970.

(c) Denmark stated that the previous traditional Danish import of raw tobacco from Southern Rhodesia had, to a wide extent, been substituted by import from Mozambique, Malawi and the Republic of South Africa.

4. Southern Rhodesian tobacco held in bond in various countries

32. At the request of the Committee, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 23 January 1969 to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, seeking information on quantities of tobacco from Southern Rhodesia held in bond in their countries.<sup>5/</sup>

33. Replies received from forty-nine States were reproduced in annex IV to the second report of the Committee.<sup>6/</sup> Eight additional replies which have since been received are summarized in annex III to the present report.<sup>7/</sup>

<sup>5/</sup> S/9252, paragraphs 19-20.

<sup>6/</sup> S/9252/Add.1, annex IV.

<sup>7/</sup> S/9844/Add.2, annex III.

34. These replies indicated that the following countries had quantities of tobacco from Southern Rhodesia in bond:

Australia - 275,531 lbs. as at 31 January 1969;

Federal Republic of Germany - 535,058.5 kg. as at 4 June 1969;

Ireland - 74,185 lbs. as at 26 February 1969;

Luxembourg - 202,522 kg. as at 9 April 1969;

Mauritius - 768,004 kg. as at 20 February 1969;

Netherlands - about 212 tons as at 23 April 1969;

New Zealand - 180,000 lbs. as at 4 March 1969;

United Kingdom - about 2,500,000 lbs. as at 31 March 1970 in the United Kingdom (including an unknown quantity originating in the constituent Territories of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland) and 106 metric tons in Hong Kong.

35. It may be noted that in a revised questionnaire sent to all Member States of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies on 23 May 1969, the Secretary-General asked for information on the quantities of Southern Rhodesian tobacco held in bond in their territories in 1967 and 1968, and at the end of each quarter of each subsequent year. The information received in reply to this questionnaire is taken into account in the Secretariat's note of 9 January 1970 on the trade of Southern Rhodesia (S/9844/Add.1, annex I).

5. Tobacco exported from Mozambique: United Kingdom notes of 15 November 1968 and 21 April 1969

36. At the request of the Committee, the Secretary-General sent a note verbale dated 6 January 1969 to twelve States, transmitting a United Kingdom note of 15 November 1968 concerning tobacco exported from Mozambique, and requesting comments.<sup>8/</sup> The United Kingdom note drew attention to the discrepancy between exports of Mozambique tobacco as indicated by the official Mozambique statistics, and imports of Mozambique tobacco as recorded in the trade statistics of the twelve importing countries.

37. The text of the United Kingdom note and the substantive parts of the replies received from nine States were reproduced in annex V to the second report.<sup>9/</sup>

<sup>8/</sup> S/9252, paragraph 21.

<sup>9/</sup> S/9252/Add.1, annex V.

38. Following the receipt of a further note dated 21 April 1969 from the United Kingdom, further notes verbale dated 19 and 20 May 1969 were sent on this matter to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, requesting them to provide statistics for imports of Mozambique tobacco since the period ending September 1967 in order to assist the Committee in establishing whether Southern Rhodesian tobacco was being exported disguised as of Mozambique origin. The note verbale dated 14 May 1969 addressed to Portugal also requested statistics relating to the export of tobacco from Mozambique. The texts of these notes were reproduced in annex VI to the second report.<sup>10/</sup>

39. No reply has been received from Portugal.

6. Southern Rhodesian tobacco exported as Malawi tobacco under forged certificates of origin: United Kingdom note of 15 November 1968

40. As indicated in its second report<sup>11/</sup>, the Committee, having received information concerning a consignment of Southern Rhodesian tobacco exported from Beira under a forged certificate of Malawi origin, took appropriate action on this matter. The substantive parts of eight additional replies which have since been received are reproduced in annex V to the present report, together with a United Kingdom note suggesting relevant proposals which were transmitted to all States concerned.<sup>12/</sup>

7. Television material

41. It may be recalled that, at the request of the Committee, the Secretary-General sent a note dated 24 January 1969 to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, transmitting a United Kingdom note of 16 December 1968<sup>13/</sup> concerning the importance of ensuring that the ban imposed under operative paragraph 3 (d) of resolution 253 (1968) was not evaded with regard to the supply of entertainment material to Southern Rhodesia<sup>7</sup>, and inviting comments.

<sup>10/</sup> S/9252/Add.1, annex VI.

<sup>11/</sup> S/9252, paragraph 25.

<sup>12/</sup> S/9844/Add.2, annex V.

<sup>13/</sup> S/9252, paragraph 27.

42. Twenty-one replies received from States were reproduced in annex VII to the second report<sup>14/</sup>, and eight additional replies are reproduced in annex V to the present report<sup>15/</sup>.

43. It may be noted that those States which replied to this note have reiterated that they have taken steps to ensure the implementation of the relevant provisions of resolution 253 (1968).

---

<sup>14/</sup> S/9252/Add.1, annex VII.

<sup>15/</sup> S/9844/Add.2, annex V.

V. CONSULAR AND TRADE REPRESENTATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

44. In its second report, the Committee referred to a note dated 7 January 1969 addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments of Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Switzerland and the United States, noting the information that they were maintaining a consulate or accredited diplomatic representation in Southern Rhodesia and seeking their comments.<sup>1/</sup>

45. The Committee has since been informed by the United Kingdom Government that, between 4 and 17 March 1970, the following countries gave notice of their intention to close their consular offices in Southern Rhodesia: Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States. In addition, on 30 April 1970, the Portuguese Government announced that its Consul-General in Salisbury would be withdrawn. He left on 9 May, although the office has remained open. There are now no consular officials in Southern Rhodesia holding United Kingdom authorization.

46. In taking note with appreciation of the action taken by the Governments mentioned above in compliance with the decisions of the Security Council, the Committee wishes to draw the Council's attention to the failure of South Africa to do so, and to the fact that the Portuguese office remains open.

---

<sup>1/</sup> S/9252, paragraphs 28-31.

VI. AIRLINES OPERATING TO AND FROM SOUTHERN RHODESIA

47. The Committee reviewed, in its second report, its enquiries concerning airlines which operate to or from Southern Rhodesia or link up with airlines or aircraft registered in Southern Rhodesia, and airlines which maintain agencies in Southern Rhodesia.

48. It noted that airlines of Malawi, Portugal and South Africa continued to operate to and from Southern Rhodesia. In response to enquiries from the Committee, the Government of Malawi stated that it was necessary for Malawi, for economic and other reasons, to maintain the air link between Blantyre and Salisbury. The Government of Portugal confirmed that airlines of TAP and DETAS touch airports in Southern Rhodesia. No reply was received from South Africa.<sup>1/</sup>

49. The Committee also noted information that airlines of Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States were maintaining agencies in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia. The representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that the representatives of the United Kingdom airlines in Southern Rhodesia did not pursue any activity contrary to the provisions of operative paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), since they did not sell tickets for Air-Rhodesia and did not transfer funds to Southern Rhodesia. The representative of the United States stated that no United States airline flew to or from Southern Rhodesia, and that no funds were transferred in connexion with the existence of any airline office. The Government of Belgium acknowledged the receipt of the Secretary-General's note. No replies were received from the Federal Republic of Germany or Italy.<sup>2/</sup>

50. At its twenty-ninth meeting, the representative of the USSR drew the attention of the Committee to a report which appeared in the press in March 1970, to the effect that the United Kingdom airlines were apparently continuing operations in Southern Rhodesia. The representative of the United Kingdom replied that the British Overseas Airways Corporation ran package tours from neighbouring countries, such as South Africa, to the United Kingdom and continental Europe, but that it had no flights to or from Southern Rhodesia itself.

<sup>1/</sup> S/9252, paragraphs 32-33 and S/9252/Add.1, annex IX.

<sup>2/</sup> S/9252, paragraphs 34-35 and S/9252/Add.1, annex IX.

## VII. IMMIGRATION AND TOURISM

51. According to information available to the Committee, the figures for European migration to and from Southern Rhodesia for the period 1965-1969 were as follows:

	<u>Immigrants</u>	<u>Emigrants</u>	<u>Net migration</u>
1965	11,130	7,670	+3,460
1966	6,420	8,510	-2,090
1967	9,620	6,300	+3,320
1968	11,860	5,650	+6,210
1969	10,930	5,890	+5,040

52. Although the net migration during 1969 of 5,040 is lower than the figure for 1968, it will be noted that there has been a net inflow of 15,940 European immigrants into Southern Rhodesia since 1965 whereas, during the period 1961-1964, there was a net emigration from the Territory of 23,510.

53. The statistical data concerning migration in Southern Rhodesia show therefore that despite the provision of paragraph 8 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the number of European immigrants to Southern Rhodesia has remained substantial during the past few years. The Committee also noted that the number of Africans leaving Southern Rhodesia has increased, although the proportion of Africans to total population has not decreased owing to a higher rate of population growth among Africans than among Europeans.

54. Information concerning visitors to the Territory during the period 1965-1969 as available to the Committee is as follows:

	<u>Total number of visitors</u>	<u>Of the total number those classified as being on holiday</u>
1965	343,378	208,725
1966	286,995	163,222
1967	297,292	193,707
1968	319,224	217,542
1969	355,490	254,441

55. It will be noted from the above figures that since 1967, there has been a steady growth in the number of persons visiting Southern Rhodesia. According to information published by the illegal régime, during 1969, visitors spent \$16.3 million in Southern Rhodesia.

56. It has also been reported that the illegal régime has announced plans in the public investment programme for 1970-1973 under which it would continue to develop airfields, national parks, game reserves and roads, particularly reconstruction of the Beitbridge/Fort Victoria Road, which was expected to attract more South African tourists to Southern Rhodesia, after its projected completion by the end of 1971. In the private sector, the illegal régime is reported to have completed five new hotels in 1969, and have more than twenty major hotel projects in various stages of implementation at a planned expenditure exceeding \$R.65 million.

#### VIII. SUSPECTED VIOLATIONS OF SANCTIONS

57. During the period under review, the Committee continued examination of the thirteen specific cases of suspected violations of the provisions of resolution 253 (1968) listed in its previous report.<sup>1/</sup> It also considered sixty new cases brought to its attention, including a number of cases of suspected shipments to and from Southern Rhodesia, as well as information on plans for trade in contravention of the provisions of resolution 253 (1968).

58. The Committee also received some information from Governments on action taken by them with respect to violations, other than those drawn to their attention by the Committee.

59. Whenever the Committee considered that the information received was sufficiently reliable, it communicated it through the Secretary-General to the Governments concerned so that they might provide the Committee with any further information in accordance with paragraphs 20 and 22 of resolution 253 (1968). Among the Governments to which some inquiries were addressed by name in connexion with specific cases were the following: Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, Greece, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia.

60. The Committee emphasized on several occasions that its communications were not to be regarded as accusations, but were intended to enable the Governments concerned to ensure that the measures envisaged by resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968) were rendered fully effective.

61. In general, Governments were co-operative with the Committee and replied. However, there were some instances where replies were not received.

62. Full texts of the original reports and additional information received by the Committee in response to its inquiries are contained in annex VII. The information is briefly reviewed below.

---

<sup>1/</sup> S/9252/Add.1, annex XI.

1. Specific cases of suspected violations brought to the attention of the Committee

(i) Minerals

63. The Committee examined thirty-four cases involving forty-one shipments of minerals. With respect to five cases concerning graphite, case No. 38 (35) "Kaapland", case No. 43 (36) "Tanga", case No. 62 (37) "Transvaal", "Stellenbosch" and "Swellendam", the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, which received these shipments informed the Committee by a note of 16 January 1970<sup>2/</sup> that the shipments had been delivered under a 1964 contract for long-term imports of graphite from a Southern Rhodesian graphite mine. It added that trade between the Federal Republic of Germany and Southern Rhodesia had declined to less than 10 per cent of its former volume and was almost exclusively confined to commodities "which are not included in the sanctions provisions" and to commodities covered by "old contracts". All but one of those contracts (the one on graphite) had expired. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that it would continue its efforts to help the importing company, which depended upon this type of graphite, to reduce or even discontinue imports from Southern Rhodesia. In a note dated 29 April 1970, the Secretary-General asked for an assurance that there would in fact be no further importation of such graphite.

64. With regard to twelve other cases, the Governments concerned informed the Committee that the commercial documents provided to the customs authorities during the verification operation had established that the shipments were of South African origin (in eleven of these cases) or of Mozambique origin (in one case), and that the cargoes therefore had been allowed to be imported.

65. In another case, despite the production of a certificate of Mozambique origin, the evidence was not judged sufficient and the country concerned (Japan) returned the shipment [case No. 15 (23) "Eizan Maru"]. In eight cases, the Governments concerned informed the Committee either that "no irregularities had been found" or that the commercial documents "had not produced any evidence that the consignment had originated in Southern Rhodesia"; and that the shipment had therefore been cleared [case No. 17 (9) "Gasikara", case No. 24 (28) "Abbekerk", case No. 25 (10) "Batu", case No. 30 (29) "Simonskerk", case No. 31 (11) "Ville de Nantes",

<sup>2/</sup> See S/9844/Add.2, annex VII, case No. 38 (35).

case No. 34 (24) copper exports, case No. 40 (14) "Ville de Reims", case No. 55 (15) "Gunvor"<sup>7</sup>. In these cases, the Committee requested further information concerning particularly the commercial documents provided. Other cases are still pending.

(ii) Tobacco

66. Of the two cases listed in the previous report concerning the trade in tobacco, the Committee received no further information on case No. 4 (38) "Mokaria"; on case No. 10 (39) "Mohasi", a reply was received from Switzerland indicating that the cargo was of Zambian origin. The matter was brought to the attention of the Zambian authorities which confirmed the Zambian origin of the cargo. The Committee was seized of three new specific cases [case No. 19 (40) "Goodwill", case No. 26 (41) tobacco transactions, and case No. 35 (42) "Montaigle"<sup>7</sup>] which are still under review.

(iii) Frozen meat

67. The Committee examined seven new cases concerning exports of frozen meat (beef and pork) from Rhodesia, in addition to the two indicated in the second report. No irregularities were found in one of the earlier cases (case No. 8 (51) "Kaaoland"<sup>7</sup>). In the second case and in three new cases (case No. 13 (52) "Zuiderkerk", case No. 16 (54) "Tugelaland", case No. 22 (55) "Swellendam" and case No. 14 (53) "Tabora"<sup>7</sup>), the receiving State, the Federal Republic of Germany, informed the Committee that the shipments had been made under a contract signed prior to the adoption of resolution 253 (1968) and that the contract, having come to an end, would not be renewed. A sixth shipment [case No. 33 (56) "Taveta"<sup>7</sup>] had been forwarded through France in sealed wagons to Switzerland; the Swiss Government informed the Committee that this shipment was imported from Southern Rhodesia under its limited trading arrangements.<sup>3/</sup> Further information has been requested concerning cargoes of meat transported on vessels "Polana" [case No. 42 (57)] and "Alcor" [case No. 68 (59)] and about an alleged air shipment.

(iv) Maize and cotton seed

68. The Committee also examined information on seven new cases of maize and cotton seed exports suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin [case No. 39 (44)

<sup>3/</sup> See S/7781, O.R. 22nd year, Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1967, pp. 117-118.

"Fraternity", case No. 44 (45) "Galini", case No. 47 (46) "Santa Alexandra", case No. 49 (47) "Zemo", case No. 56 (48) "Julia L.", case No. 63 (49) "Polyxene C" and case No. 53 (50) "Holly Trader"]<sup>7</sup>. At the request of the Committee, verifications were made by the receiving State (Japan) which reported that these consignments, all accompanied by import documents from Beira (Mozambique), had been allowed to be imported as of Mozambique origin, since Mozambique was one of its traditional suppliers.

(v) Sugar

69. Concerning sugar exports, four new cases were submitted to the Committee [case No. 28 (60) "Byzantine Monarch", case No. 60 (61) "Filotis", case No. 65 (62) "Eleni" and case No. 72 (63) "Lavrentios"]<sup>7</sup>. They are still under review.

(vi) Ammonia

70. The Committee was informed of four cases of possible import of ammonia to Southern Rhodesia [case No. 48 (65) "Butaneuve", case No. 52 (66) bulk ammonia, case No. 66 (67) "Cérons" and case No. 69 (68) "Mariotte"]<sup>7</sup>. They are still under review.

(vii) Assembly and sale of automobiles

71. In its second report, the Committee referred to information supplied by the United States Government, indicating that new automobiles of foreign manufacture were being assembled and sold in Rhodesia (S/9252/Add.1, annex XI, p. 46). Since then, replies have been received from the Governments concerned to the Secretary-General's note of 15 January 1970 and further information has been provided by the United Kingdom Government in two notes dated 11 March and 10 April 1970 respectively, suggesting that in some cases, new automobiles of foreign manufacture had been assembled and sold in Rhodesia with the knowledge or connivance of the manufacturers. The matter is still under review.<sup>4/</sup>

---

<sup>4/</sup> See S/9844/Add.2, annex VII (case No. 9 (69)).

2. Actions taken by States to prevent violations of sanctions

72. Following information communicated by the Committee, some Governments concerned have reported to it on action taken by them to prevent violations of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

73. In specific cases of possible violation, the measures applied by these Governments included the denying to vessels thought to be involved in illegal trade of such rights as docking, unloading or trans-shipments [case No. 6 (4) "Blue Sky", case No. 14 (53) "Tabora" and case No. 59 (17) shipments of ferrochrome]. In one case [case No. 59 (17) shipments of ferrochrome], a fraudulent import licence was denied.

74. In another case of suspected exports to Rhodesia, indirectly through a third party, a written undertaking was requested excluding the possibility of resale of the goods in question to Rhodesia [case No. 52 (66) bulk ammonia].

75. The Committee was informed of three instances in which contracts had been either refused or abrogated by French firms fearing that they concerned attempts to evade sanctions. In the first instance, a manufacturer of electrical equipment had refused an order for transformers destined for the Sherwood sub-station in Southern Rhodesia. In the second, the French customs had seized a consignment of butyl which was ostensibly destined for Mozambique but was, according to the United Kingdom authorities, to be delivered to the Dunlop plant in Bulawayo, Rhodesia. In the third, a company had refused delivery of a consignment of ferrochrome which it suspected to be of Southern Rhodesian origin.

76. The practice has increased of including in the charters of the vessels a "rider clause" under which the charterers stipulate that no cargo of Southern Rhodesian origin shall be taken aboard [case No. 63 (43) "Polyxene C"].

77. The Committee has conveyed its appreciation to the Government of Japan, through the Secretary-General, in a note of 30 September 1969, for the action taken concerning a cargo of copper concentrates; the cargo had been returned in the absence of sufficient evidence that the goods were of Mozambique origin, as had been claimed [case No. 15 (23) "Eizen Maru"].

78. The Committee's appreciation was also conveyed to the Government of Mexico, in a note of 20 February 1970 from the Secretary-General, in connexion with the cancellation by a Mexican firm of a transaction in Southern Rhodesian ferrochrome [case No. 59 (17)].

3. Actions taken by States on specific cases of violations

79. The Committee noted with appreciation that in the case of the shipment of ferrochrome transported by the vessel "Halleren" [case No. 37 (13)]7, the Government of Finland indicated on 12 March 1970 that the Finnish authorities, on the basis of the evidence obtained, were considering the possibility of instituting legal proceedings against the importers.

80. Furthermore, four Governments - Denmark, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States - have reported to the Committee the following cases in which legal proceedings were initiated against companies or individuals for the contravention of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia:

(i) By a note dated 16 July 1969, the Permanent Mission of Italy informed the Committee of the seizure by the Italian customs authorities of 250 tons of Southern Rhodesian tobacco. This cargo, intended for the United Arab Republic and bonded in transit at Venice and Trieste, had been transported partly under a certificate of origin issued by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Malawi and partly under a certificate of origin issued by the United Kingdom Consulate at Beira (Mozambique). The Italian note indicated that, with the assistance of the United Kingdom Embassy in Italy, the Italian authorities had been able to establish that the two certificates were forgeries. The judicial authorities had been seized of the matter.

(ii) At the 23rd meeting of the Committee on 21 November 1969, and by a subsequent note of 22 November 1969, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom informed the Committee of a judicial action taken against a group of United Kingdom companies which had been found guilty on five counts of dealing in goods with intent to evade prohibition on exports. Fines totalling £ Stg. 100,020 had been imposed.

(iii) (a) By a note of 23 April 1970, the Acting Permanent Representative of Denmark informed the Committee that a judgement had been pronounced by the Copenhagen City Court against a Danish company and its managing director for business transactions with a Southern Rhodesian firm in violation of Danish legislation pertaining to resolution 253 (1968). The consignment of 10,170 kilos of mica powder was confiscated and fines were imposed which together with the judicial costs reached a total of 165,839 kroner.

/...

(b) By a subsequent note of 20 May 1970, the Permanent Representative of Denmark informed the Committee of another judicial case in which a fine of 5,000 kroner had been imposed on a fraudulent importer.

(iv) In March 1970, a United States metal importer, Muller and Co., was indicted by a United States federal grand jury for illegally conspiring to import Rhodesian chrome ore in contravention of United States Rhodesian sanctions regulations. The firm pleaded guilty and was fined in accordance with relevant United States laws.

81. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Governments which had taken action in these five cases.

#### 4. Other related information

82. The Committee also received relevant information of a more general nature which it communicated to the Governments directly or potentially concerned.

83. As indicated in the second report (S/9252/Add.1, annex XI pp. 13-15), the Committee received and forwarded information on the possible export of Rhodesian chrome ore and ferrochrome to European importers through the firm Universal Exports Limited (Univex), specially set up by the régime to co-ordinate the evasion of sanctions; two additional acknowledgements from States concerned have been received to the Secretary-General's note on the matter [case No. 5 (3)].

84. On exports of lithium ore, the Committee received two successive notes dated 3 July 1969 and 27 August 1969, from the United Kingdom representative, pointing out that Rhodesia was by far the largest source of this mineral in southern Africa. Since the stocks of Rhodesian origin of this mineral, and particularly of petalite, which had been accumulated at Beira prior to the adoption of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) had by then been exhausted, any further exports of this mineral might be assumed to be a breach of sanctions [case No. 21 (27)].

85. Concerning copper exports, by a note dated 13 August 1969, the United Kingdom representative drew the attention of the Committee to the purchase in 1968 by a South African company of the Edmundian copper mine in Mozambique which had not been worked for six or seven years, as it had been considered a completely uneconomical proposition. The purpose of re-opening this mine, which eventually took place in August 1969, was understood to be to provide a cover for the export of Rhodesian production [case No. 34 (24)].

86. Information on plans to import fertilizers to Southern Rhodesia from Europe on a regular basis, as well as replies then received on that matter, have been referred to in the second report of the Committee (S/9252, Add.1, annex XI, pp. 30-37). Since then seven other Governments have indicated their support to frustrate possible infractions in that regard. However, as the reply by the Government of Switzerland left some doubt as to whether it was contemplating taking steps to enable its authorities to exercise the requisite jurisdiction and control over an enterprise involved in this trade, further information was requested from that Government. No reply has yet been received to the Secretary-General's note of 24 February 1970 [case No. 2 (64)]<sup>7</sup>.

87. With regard to tobacco exports, the Committee was informed, in connexion with the shipment aboard the vessel "Mohasi" [case No. 10 (39)]<sup>7</sup> that since Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence, the Government of Zambia had been issuing a document called the Bill of Entry for the authorized export of goods after the requirements of the law have been satisfied. This practice was instituted in order to avoid any confusion between tobacco of Zambian origin and tobacco of Rhodesian origin. It may be recalled in that connexion that as indicated in the second report, the Government of Malawi has also informed the Committee by a letter of 17 April 1969 that the control on the issuing of certificates of origin of Malawi tobacco had been tightened.<sup>5/</sup>

88. On the same subject, the Committee was also informed of a possible transaction between Southern Rhodesia and South American and European firms. This information was communicated to the States concerned [case No. 26 (41)]<sup>7</sup>.

89. A note dated 20 June 1969 from the United Kingdom Government stating that there had been a substantial increase in maize crop in Rhodesia and that maize might be exported as of disguised Mozambique origin, was also transmitted to all Member States or members of the specialized agencies [case No. 18 (43)]<sup>7</sup>.

90. By two notes dated 15 October and 10 November 1969, the United Kingdom representative supplied information to the effect that a Southern Rhodesian company was seeking to conclude a long-term arrangement for the import of bulk ammonia which is important for Rhodesia which uses it to produce nitrogenous

---

<sup>5/</sup> S/9252/Add.1, annex VII, pp. 5-6.

fertilizers. The matter was brought to the attention of the Governments concerned which subsequently indicated that they had taken appropriate measures [case No. 52 (66)].

91. The possibility that aircraft spares or even secondhand aircraft might be supplied to Southern Rhodesia was also brought to the attention of the Committee. By a note dated 15 September 1969, the United Kingdom Government informed the Committee that arrangements had been made whereby a Mozambique firm was importing aircraft spares for resale to Southern Rhodesia. The matter was brought to the attention of the States concerned. The Government of Malawi informed the Committee that Air Malawi, having no maintenance facilities for its aircraft, had to depend on Air Rhodesia maintenance base. The spares held by Air Rhodesia were operated on a pool basis to serve the two airlines and this made it difficult to say that spares ordered were in fact used on Air Malawi aircraft. The Malawi Government hoped to bring this situation to an end as soon as the Air Malawi maintenance base now in construction began functioning [case No. 41 (71)].

92. By another note of 21 January 1970, the United Kingdom Government informed the Committee that Rhodesia was seeking to acquire secondhand Viscount aircraft, taking advantage of the re-equipment of present owners with more modern aircraft. This information was communicated to all States concerned, suggesting that appropriate steps be taken to ensure that adequate inquiries were made before disposing of such aircraft in order to make sure that they would not ultimately be acquired by Air Rhodesia [case No. 67 (72)].

93. The Committee also communicated to the States concerned a note dated 2 October 1969 from the United Kingdom Government according to which a plan had been developed to provide Southern Rhodesia with tractor kits to be assembled in the country [case No. 50 (70)].

94. Finally, by a note dated 6 November 1969, the Italian Government reported to the Committee that it had received information about arrangements for importing into Southern Rhodesia accounting and book-keeping machines which would be supplied by the firm Olympia of the Federal Republic of Germany [case No. 58 (73)]. The Federal Republic of Germany stated in response to a note from the Committee that Olympia-Werke had declared that it had ceased deliveries to Southern Rhodesia

on the imposition of sanctions against that Territory. The Company added that as the trade routes from neighbouring countries to Southern Rhodesia were not completely blocked, it was impossible for them to guarantee that Olympia machines would not continue to be sold in Southern Rhodesia.

/...

#### IX. FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

95. In the course of its work during the period covered by the present report, members of the Committee submitted to it a number of suggestions concerning the methods and procedures to be followed by it in the discharge of the tasks entrusted to it by the Security Council. After detailed consideration of the various suggestions made by members, the Committee took the following decisions:

- (i) Each individual report of a suspected violation of sanctions, together with the comments of the Governments concerned, should be circulated separately by the Committee as an unrestricted document at a relatively short period (to be decided in each case by the Committee) after the Governments concerned had had the opportunity to investigate and comment on it.
- (ii) Relevant trade statistics together with an analysis thereof should be made available to the Committee by the Secretariat at least every six months, if not at shorter intervals. As soon as possible after its receipt by the Committee, this material should be circulated separately by the Committee as an unrestricted document.
- (iii) In addition to the trade statistics referred to in (ii) above, the Secretariat should make studies on trade in specific commodities including in particular tobacco, asbestos, chrome, copper and maize, and submit them to the Committee. After considering each such study, the Committee will decide whether it should be circulated as a document.
- (iv) The Secretariat should make available to the members of the Committee, at periodic intervals, information relevant to the work of the Committee which it might be able to obtain from published sources including Press reports.
- (v) The Committee should make more frequent reports to the Security Council.
- (vi) When the Committee considers it appropriate, it should issue Press communiqués concerning matters which might be of immediate general interest, such as the successful detection and prevention of sanctions evasions.

(vii) In order to enable all the members of the Security Council to be kept informed of the work of the Committee, restricted documents such as summary records of its proceedings should be distributed to all Council members.

96. Further, the Committee took note of the additional responsibilities entrusted to it by the Security Council by its resolution 277 (1970), the relevant operative paragraphs of which are reproduced below:

"20. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the implementation of this resolution, the first report not to be made later than 1 July 1970;

"21. Decides that the Committee of the Security Council established by resolution 253 (1968), in accordance with rule 28 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, shall be entrusted with the responsibility of:

"(a) Examining such reports on the implementation of the present resolution as will be submitted by the Secretary-General;

"(b) To seek from Member States such further information regarding the effective implementation of the provisions laid down in the present resolution as it may consider necessary for the proper discharge of its duty to report to the Security Council;

"(c) To study ways and means by which Member States could carry out more effectively the decisions of the Security Council regarding sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and to make recommendations to the Security Council;

"22. Requests the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to continue to give maximum assistance to the Committee and to provide the Committee with any information which it may receive in order that the measures envisaged in this resolution as well as resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968) may be rendered fully effective;

"23. Calls upon Member States as well as the specialized agencies to supply such information as may be sought by the Committee in pursuance of this resolution;"

97. In this connexion, the Committee has taken particular note of operative paragraph 21 (c), by which the Committee has been entrusted with the responsibility of studying ways and means by which Member States could carry out more effectively the decisions of the Security Council regarding sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and to make recommendations to the Security Council.

/...

98. Having regard to the tasks entrusted to the Committee by the Security Council by its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) and the decisions concerning future work set out in paragraph 1 above, the Committee expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would continue to provide the Committee with all the assistance necessary for the proper discharge of its tasks.

## X. OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

99. The Committee regrets to note that the measures taken by the Security Council in regard to Southern Rhodesia, including the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia, have not been fully effective and have not led to the desired results. Although there has been some effect on agricultural exports from Southern Rhodesia, mineral exports have increased and are likely to increase in 1970.

100. As a result of the adoption of Security Council resolution 277 (1970), the Committee has been entrusted with additional responsibilities "to study ways and means by which Member States could carry out more effectively the decisions of the Security Council regarding sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and to make recommendations to the Security Council". The number of cases of suspected sanctions-breaking notified to the Committee has increased considerably since the last report.

101. The Committee considers it highly desirable, however, that more Members of the United Nations should report to the Committee cases of suspected sanctions-breaking where they have reliable evidence. The Committee needs from Member States full details and, where appropriate, the relevant documentation. The Committee notes that many of the replies received from certain Governments to its requests for information about their investigations of suspected evasions have been incomplete and that lengthy periods have elapsed in some cases before replies have been received. The Committee intends to study further cases of action taken by national Governments or courts against companies and individuals continuing to trade illegally with Southern Rhodesia.

102. The Committee regrets the lack of co-operation on the part of certain countries.

103. It should be stated that the Committee has strong grounds for affirming that the Republic of South Africa and Portugal, in spite of repeated appeals by the Security Council and in defiance of its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), are continuing to trade with Southern Rhodesia, and this is considerably reducing the effectiveness of the sanctions called for by the Security Council in its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970).

104. The Committee considers that the Security Council should again draw the attention of Member States, in particular South Africa and Portugal, to the obligations of Member States under Articles 25, 48 and 49 of the Charter.

105. Southern Rhodesia's products find their market in many countries other than Portugal and South Africa. The Committee wishes to stress the need for more co-operation by the main maritime Powers with the work of the Committee. The Committee intends to consider whether the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization can play a useful role in this regard. The Committee thinks it desirable that those Members of the United Nations which have not taken measures (legislative, administrative or juridical) to control their shipping in accordance with paragraph 3 (e) of resolution 253 (1968) should do so urgently. The Committee wishes to point out the desirability of national authorities at trans-shipment ports and at free ports investigating carefully the origin of any goods in transit through their territories which have been reported to them as being suspect in origin.

106. The Committee noted with concern that, in spite of paragraph 8 of resolution 253 (1968), European immigration into Southern Rhodesia remains substantial, and has this matter under active consideration.

107. The above observations and recommendations were agreed upon by the Committee after consideration of proposals submitted to it by certain delegations. Other suggestions for observations and recommendations were made but were not agreed upon. The full texts of the proposals made by Nepal and the USSR are included as appendices I and II. Discussion of these texts is summarized in the records of the Committee's thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth meetings which are included as appendix III.

APPENDIX I

WORKING PAPER SUBMITTED BY NEPAL ON THE FINAL CHAPTER  
OF THE REPORT

1. The facts that South Africa and Portugal have not abided by Security Council resolutions and that sanctions have not brought about the desired results are mentioned in the Committee's earlier reports. The logical thing would be now to confirm those findings and further observe categorically that those two countries have violated not only their obligations under Articles 25, 48 and 49, but also the principles contained in Article 2, paragraph 2.
2. In the light of the foregoing, the Committee should recommend, as a first step, that sanctions, in partial or total forms, be extended to South Africa and Portugal, and that all measures provided for in Article 41 be applied against Southern Rhodesia.
3. As borne out both by Southern Rhodesia's Economic Survey and the related British paper, observation should be made to the effect that, although there has been some effect on agricultural exports, the mineral exports have increased and are likely to increase in 1970. Attention of Governments should be drawn to this.
4. Obviously, Southern Rhodesia's products find their market in many countries other than Portugal and South Africa. In our observations, we should stress the need for more co-operation by the main maritime Powers with the work of the Committee. The Committee intends to consider whether the role of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization can be useful.
5. That immigration into Southern Rhodesia remains substantial should be pointed out in this section of the report. While it is difficult for Governments to stop this flow of individual human traffic, the Committee can recommend that Governments, particularly British and other European, consider:
  - (i) the status of the immigrants vis-à-vis countries of their original nationality while Southern Rhodesia retains the present illegal status;
  - (ii) the status of the immigrants after Southern Rhodesia returns to legality.
6. The Committee should recommend that all Governments refuse to recognize the new Rhodesian postal stamps.

/...

It is understood that the observations made above are without prejudice to the special responsibility of the administering Power to put an end to the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia by all means at its disposal, including the use of force, with a view to conceding immediate independence to the people of that Territory on the basis of well-known democratic principles.

## APPENDIX II

### OBSERVATIONS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE USSR ON THE NATURE OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH MIGHT BE INCLUDED IN THE FINAL SECTION OF THE THIRD REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTHERN RHODESIA

By analogy with the two previous reports, and particularly in pursuance of Security Council resolution 277, the third report of the Security Council Committee on Sanctions against Southern Rhodesia should include a special section entitled "Conclusions and recommendations". In this section it would, it seems, be advisable to reflect the following points:

1. It should be noted that, as a result of the adoption of Security Council resolution 277 (1970), the Committee has been entrusted with additional responsibilities "to study ways and means by which Member States could carry out more effectively the decisions of the Security Council regarding sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and to make recommendations to the Security Council".

2. It should be stated that the Committee has strong grounds for affirming that the Republic of South Africa and Portugal, in spite of repeated appeals by the Security Council and in defiance of its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), are continuing to give active assistance to Southern Rhodesia, and that this is considerably reducing the effectiveness of the sanctions called for by the Security Council in its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970).

3. It should be pointed out that the extensive trade and economic relations maintained by the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and certain other countries with the Republic of South Africa are nullifying the effect of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia decided upon by the Security Council, since it has been established that large amounts of merchandise are reaching Southern Rhodesia through the Republic of South Africa.

It should be noted in this connexion that, for eight months of 1969 alone, United States exports to the Republic of South Africa were \$18.8 million higher

/...

than for the corresponding period of 1968, and exports from Western Germany increased by \$38.4 million, from Japan by \$48 million, from the United Kingdom by \$17.5 million, etc.

4. It should be stated that the measures hitherto taken by the Security Council in regard to Southern Rhodesia, including the sanctions imposed against Southern Rhodesia, have not led to positive results - to the liberation of the Zimbabwe people from the murderous tyranny of the Southern Rhodesian racist régime.

5. The use of foreign capital in the Southern Rhodesian economy, which is condemned in resolution 253 (1968), is continuing as before. For example, according to press reports, United States investments in Southern Rhodesia amount to \$55 million, United Kingdom investments to £200 million, etc.

\* \*  
\*

1. With a view to improving the Committee's work, attention should be drawn to the need for extending the membership of the Committee in order to ensure wider representation of the Afro-Asian States. An increase in the membership of the Committee would also be in keeping with the character of other similar Security Council committees.

2. It should be stated that the Committee considers it desirable to give wider publicity to its work, and that it is therefore abandoning the practice of holding closed meetings and intends to circulate the records of its meetings to all members of the Security Council.

3. The sanctions decided upon by the Security Council in its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) amount in essence only to selective and partial measures, which cannot produce effective results even if they are complied with by all States. The Security Council should therefore use all the sanctions provided for in Article 41 of the Charter, including complete interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication.

4. The continuing practice of active support for Southern Rhodesia by the Republic of South Africa and Portugal makes it necessary to adopt and extend

/...

sanctions to the Republic of South Africa and Portugal - particularly, sanctions which would prohibit all States from supplying South Africa and Portugal with goods of the kind which are later reshipped to Southern Rhodesia.

5. The Security Council should draw the attention of States to the fact that failure to comply with its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) is a violation of the obligations assumed under Articles 25, 48 and 49 of the Charter of the United Nations.

6. It would be advisable to express the wish that the Security Council should recommend States to demand that monopolies, companies and affiliates thereof registered in their territories should terminate activities of all kinds in Southern Rhodesia, stop investing capital in the Southern Rhodesian economy and withdraw existing investments from Southern Rhodesia.

7. In view of the ineffectiveness of the sanctions adopted against Southern Rhodesia, the Security Council should be recommended to affirm that the measures provided for in Article 41 of the Charter are inadequate, and to propose that the United Kingdom, as administering Power, should take action by armed force to put an end to the domination of the racist group in Southern Rhodesia.

8. It would seem to be desirable, as suggested in the note from Nepal, to prepare a report on action taken by national Governments or courts against companies and monopolies continuing to trade illegally with Southern Rhodesia.

(Signed) N. TARASSOV

5 June 1970

APPENDIX III

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH AND THIRTY-FIFTH  
MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 15 JUNE 1970 1/

(1) Thirty-fourth meeting

Chapter X. Observations and recommendations

Mr. TARASSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the report should note that, as a result of the adoption of Security Council resolution 277 (1970), the Committee had been entrusted with the additional responsibility of studying ways and means by which Member States could carry out more effectively the decisions of the Security Council regarding sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia and make recommendations to the Council. In addition, it should be noted in the report that, despite repeated appeals by the Security Council and in defiance of its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970), the Republic of South Africa and Portugal were continuing to give active assistance to Southern Rhodesia and were thus reducing the effectiveness of the sanctions called for by the Security Council. The Rhodesian economy was being developed only because a number of States, primarily the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and certain other countries, maintained extensive trade and economic relations with the Republic of South Africa, which nullified the effect of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. There were many facts to demonstrate that most of the goods imported and exported by Southern Rhodesia were being shipped through the Republic of South Africa. It was very revealing that, for eight months of 1969 alone, United States exports to the Republic of South Africa had been \$18.8 million higher than for the corresponding period of 1968, that exports from Western Germany had increased by \$38.4 million, from Japan by \$48 million and from the United Kingdom by \$17.5 million. Obviously, the Committee should state that the measures taken by the Security Council, including the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia, had not led to the liberation of the people

---

1/ The references to chapters and paragraphs have been corrected in accordance with the numbering used in the final text of the third report.

of Zimbabwe from the murderous tyranny of the Southern Rhodesian racist régime, which was their main objective. The development of the Rhodesian economy could also be explained by the continuing use of foreign capital. For example, United States investments in Southern Rhodesia amounted to \$55 million and those of the United Kingdom to \$200 million.

In its recommendations, the report should refer to the desirability of enlarging the membership of the Committee. An unjustifiable situation had arisen in which the Committee, which now consisted of seven members - most of whom were from the Western countries - had only one representative from Africa. The report should also mention the need to give wider publicity to the work of the Committee and to abandon the practice of holding closed meetings. The overwhelming majority of Member States supported the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and there was no reason for the Committee to conceal its work from other Members of the United Nations.

Another reason why the sanctions had failed to achieve their objective was that they were essentially selective and piece-meal measures which could hardly produce effective results even if they were fully implemented. Accordingly, the report should recommend the Security Council to apply all the sanctions provided for in Article 41 of the Charter, including the complete interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication. It was also clear that Portugal and the Republic of South Africa had given and would continue to give Southern Rhodesia all possible assistance in order to offset the effects of the sanctions. It was therefore imperative to request the Security Council to extend sanctions to Portugal and the Republic of South Africa, particularly sanctions which would prohibit all States from supplying South Africa and Portugal with goods which were then forwarded to Southern Rhodesia. He realized that appropriate steps had not been taken in the Security Council because of the veto exercised by the United Kingdom and the United States. Nevertheless, the Committee had been instructed to ascertain how sanctions were being implemented and it should state its belief that sanctions should be extended to those countries which were assisting the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

The Security Council should also draw the attention of States to the fact that failure to comply with its resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) was a

violation of the obligations assumed under Articles 25, 48 and 49 of the Charter. Although the States at fault were aware of that fact, such a reminder might be of some additional moral and political value. Similarly, the report could express the wish that the Security Council should recommend to States that monopolies and companies registered in their territories should terminate activities of all kinds in Southern Rhodesia, should stop investing capital in the Rhodesian economy and withdraw their existing investments. It also seemed desirable, as suggested in the note submitted by Nepal, to prepare a report on action taken by Governments or their legal authorities against monopolies and companies which continued to trade illegally with Southern Rhodesia, a report which should be given the widest publicity. Lastly, the measures provided for in Article 41 of the Charter were inadequate and the Committee should recommend that the Council propose that the United Kingdom, as administering Power, should take action by armed force to put an end to the domination of the racist group in Southern Rhodesia.

His delegation recognized that the Committee could not have carried on its work without the information on suspected violations provided by the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, he was not convinced that the United Kingdom itself had not violated the sanctions. With an enlarged membership, the Committee would be more objective in its consideration of cases. At present, it acted as a kind of screen for the United Kingdom, which was endeavouring to conceal its own policy of condoning the régime in Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) agreed that the report should point to the fact that some Member States had failed to co-operate in the implementation of sanctions and that the measures taken thus far had not led to positive results, although he would prefer to say, as had the USSR representative, that the sanctions had not achieved their main objective - which was of course political.

Many members had pointed out that the Security Council had decided to revert to the question of enlarging the membership of the Committee after the latter had submitted its third report. In his view, that decision was a reasonable one. It had been stressed that, in the United Nations, the alternatives were a small and a practical working body or a large but unwieldy committee which was merely a forum for endless discussion. His delegation had always felt that the Committee had been efficient precisely because it was small. Moreover, it had been objective in its

deliberations and he questioned the assertion that a larger membership would lead to greater objectivity.

If the United Kingdom had considered that it was in a position to take effective steps against the Southern Rhodesian régime, it would not have appealed to the United Nations for assistance and the whole question of sanctions would not have arisen in the Security Council. Moreover, it had sought United Nations help because it could not contemplate using armed force against the rebellious Smith régime. At the time, it had explained that it was almost fifty years since the United Kingdom had exercised control over the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia.

If the Committee were to abandon the practice of holding closed meetings as recommended by the Soviet Union, its sources of information might dry up, with the result that its work would be less effective. Like the question of the size of the Committee, the matter of open or closed meetings could only be decided by the Security Council, and not the Committee. He did not agree with the Soviet representative that the sanctions provided for in resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) were "limited and piecemeal", particularly since resolution 277 (1970) called for a total economic embargo of Southern Rhodesia. To extend the sanctions to South Africa and Portugal, as recommended by the USSR, would be a major step and only the Security Council itself could take a decision on such an important question.

The investments by a number of Western countries, including the United Kingdom, in Southern Rhodesia had been made by independent companies which could not and did not now receive funds from the United Kingdom or remit funds to it. It was meaningless to talk of removing fixed capital assets from Southern Rhodesia. Moreover, it had long been accepted that associate companies should not be subordinate to their parent companies and should act independently in accordance with the laws of the country in which they conducted their business. Since trade with South Africa was most important to it, the United Kingdom, like many other States, could not contemplate action against that country. The figures quoted by the USSR representative concerning the increasing trade of certain Western countries with South Africa did not take inflation into account; in order to be truly meaningful, the figures should indicate the percentage increase and

thus show which countries had increased their trade with South Africa most significantly. Such an approach would show that the countries mentioned by the USSR were not the ones with the biggest percentage increases. Besides, no causal connexion had been established between increased trade with South Africa and violations of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. Replying to the USSR allegation that the United Kingdom was violating the sanctions, he said that this was totally unwarranted; there had been a very few violations by individual British firms, but the United Kingdom Government had taken action against those firms.

With regard to the suggestions submitted by the United Kingdom for the final section of the report, he said that the wording was less important than the substance. The Committee's observations should draw attention to the increased number of cases of suspected violations of sanctions notified since the last report and the need for more United Nations members to report suspected violations where they had reliable evidence. The observations should also stress the need for the Committee to receive full details, the incomplete nature of many Government replies to requests for information and the lack of co-operation on the part of certain countries. It should also be stated that it was desirable for some Members of the United Nations urgently to take legislative measures to control their shipping in accordance with paragraph 3 (e) of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) so that those countries would be in a better position to take action when they were informed of possible violations of the sanctions. Lastly, the observations should stress the desirability of the national authorities at transshipment ports and free ports investigating carefully the origin of any goods which might be suspect in origin.

The table drawn up by the Secretariat showed that many points in the three lists of suggestions for the final section of the report had a good deal in common and it was to be hoped that the Committee would be able to reach agreement on a single text.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that no proof had been offered for the statement made in the USSR paper that the extensive trade and economic relations of certain Western Powers with the Republic of South Africa were "nullifying the effect of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia". The trade

figures quoted in the Soviet paper were meaningless since they did not indicate percentage increases or support the allegation that that trade was being diverted to Southern Rhodesia in violation of the sanctions. His country had faithfully applied the sanctions and its trade with Southern Rhodesia was now almost non-existent. Only one case of sanctions violations had been established and the company concerned had been prosecuted.

The USSR representative's choice of the countries for which he had given trade statistics was completely arbitrary and based solely on political considerations. The countries named were not the only ones which still traded with South Africa. For example, an article which had recently appeared in Pravda on 10 June revealed that mainland China bought a considerable amount of chrome from Rhodesia and that, in 1969, its trade with Rhodesia had been three times that of the previous year. Rhodesian chrome was sent to Beira in Mozambique, and from there Portuguese ships take it to the Portuguese enclave of Macao on Chinese territory. The United States, on the other hand, bought chrome at a more expensive rate elsewhere in order to apply the sanctions. If the Soviet representative were really interested in sanctions enforcement, rather than making political propaganda, the countries selected for citation in this paragraph certainly would have been quite different, and he would have reported the Peiping violations to the Committee. Furthermore, in the interest of preserving the stability of the world economy, the United States had opposed South Africa's efforts to raise the price of gold; if the price had been raised, it would have been profitable for both South Africa and for the USSR.

He agreed with the USSR representative that the report should state that the sanctions had so far not accomplished their main objective. However, he was opposed to the use of the word "murderous" in speaking of the Southern Rhodesian régime; other tyrannies had behaved more scandalously in that respect. As to foreign investments in Southern Rhodesia, he pointed out that there had been no new United States investments in that country and that even before the sanctions had been applied, United States investments in Southern Rhodesia were insignificant and amounted to less than .0001 of total United States investments throughout the world. His Government had no control over those funds.

/...

Since there was no consensus on the question of enlarging the membership of the Committee, he felt that that question should be considered after the report had been submitted. The question whether the Committee should have open or closed meetings should be decided later after a decision had been taken on enlargement of the membership.

With regard to the USSR proposal that the Security Council should apply all the sanctions provided for under Article 41 of the Charter, he had serious objection to the application of sanctions to posts and telecommunications, which were not yet mandatory. Approximately 1,000 United States citizens were living in Southern Rhodesia, almost all of them missionaries working with the African population. The United States had been reluctant to close its consulate because it wanted to protect its own nationals, but it had eventually done so when Southern Rhodesia proclaimed itself a Republic. It would not be fair to those United States citizens in Southern Rhodesia to cut off all means of communication with the rest of the world and all means of leaving the country. Application of such aspects of Article 41 of the Charter was therefore neither realistic nor practical in the present situation.

With regard to extending the sanctions to South Africa and Portugal, Ambassador Yost had already stated in the Security Council that the United States believed that such a procedure would lead to additional grave complications and would be very unwise. He agreed with the USSR representative that all States should comply with Council resolutions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970). With regard to the use of force against Southern Rhodesia, he emphasized that there was no way to force a permanent member of the Security Council to go to war against its wishes. The United Kingdom had already stated that it was not prepared to use force against the Smith régime and it would be particularly dangerous to embark on such a course in southern Africa. He agreed with the USSR recommendation that a report should be prepared on action taken by national Governments or courts against companies continuing to trade illegally with Southern Rhodesia.

He agreed with the United Kingdom recommendations and found them very helpful. The same was true of most of the recommendations made by Nepal. However, he did not agree with the suggestion made in the working paper submitted by Nepal that Article 2 (5) of the Charter could be invoked, since Southern Rhodesia was

not legally a State. As to the Nepalese proposal that the Committee should recommend that all Governments refuse to recognize the new Rhodesian postage stamps, he said it would be unthinkable for the United States to refuse to deliver a missionary's letter to his family in the United States merely because the only postage stamp he could buy happened to be a "Rhodesian" stamp.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, if the Committee were to leave out those proposals which had essentially partisan political motivations, and certain proposals which obviously could not command a consensus, there were significant common elements in all three drafts which could be adopted, could make very helpful recommendations to the Security Council and which his delegation would be prepared to support.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) said, with regard to the Nepalese proposal that all Governments should refuse to recognize the new Rhodesian postage stamps, that his Government had informed the Universal Postal Union that the stamps were invalid.

Mr. BHATT (Nepal) said that the proposals which his delegation had circulated to the members should be considered as having been formally submitted.

Mr. ORTEGA-URBINA (Nicaragua) felt that the Committee's membership should not be enlarged since that would mean altering an established system. It was for the Security Council to decide whether the Committee's meetings should be open or closed. He felt that it would not be a humanitarian act to cut off all communications with Southern Rhodesia and that nothing was to be gained from isolating the indigenous population from the rest of the world. On the contrary, if those people were aware of the rights and freedoms that existed elsewhere they would be in a better position to remedy their own situation. The question of extending the sanctions to Portugal and South Africa was a very important one and it would be better for the Security Council itself, and not the Committee, to take a decision on the matter. The Committee should ensure that no new investments were made in Southern Rhodesia, but it should not recommend the use of force or any other measures which could lead to loss of human life.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representatives of Nepal, the United Kingdom and the USSR might meet informally with a view to arrive at an agreed text on chapter X of the report for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting.

It was so decided.

(2) Thirty-fifth meeting

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) expressed regret that the Nepalese, Soviet and United Kingdom delegations had failed, at their informal meeting, to arrive at an agreed text of chapter X of the report. The Committee would have to decide whether it wished to submit separate reports or an agreed report supplemented by a minority report. Since it was clear that agreement on some conclusions and recommendations had been reached, he considered it preferable to submit a report recording those conclusions as well as dissenting views and other points on which there was no consensus; otherwise the report would not represent all the views expressed in the Committee.

Agreement had been reached on his delegation's draft proposals, subject to the replacement of the word "legislative" by "measures (legislative, administrative or juridical)" in paragraph (f). With regard to the Nepalese draft proposals, the first paragraph of item 1 had been agreed upon, subject to the deletion of "and 5" from the end of the last sentence. There had been no agreement on the second paragraph of that item. Item 2 had been agreed upon. With regard to the third sentence of item 3, the role of IMCO had not been considered by the Committee; his delegation therefore proposed that the words "Perhaps" should be replaced by "The Committee intends to consider whether". Item 4 had been agreed upon, subject to replacement of the words "by issuing proclamations or declarations, define" by "consider". With regard to item 5, his delegation had suggested that the words "new Rhodesian postal stamps" should be followed by a comma and "which are invalid". Item 6 had been deleted. It had been proposed that item 7 should be deferred for further consideration, and perhaps included in a section containing matters on which the Committee had failed to reach agreement.

There had been no objection to the introductory paragraph of item 1 of the Soviet draft proposals. With regard to item 2, his delegation felt that the words "give active assistance to" should be replaced by "continue to trade with". There was considerable disagreement over item 3. In his delegation's view, statistics of South Africa's trade with other countries for the past three years should show which countries had proportionately increased their trade with that country, and by how much. Item 4 was more or less the same as item 1 of the Nepalese draft proposals. There was disagreement over item 5: although the Soviet delegation

referred to the continuing use of foreign capital which was in Southern Rhodesia before the unilateral declaration of independence, his own delegation noted that Security Council resolution 253 (1968) called upon States to cut off the flow of capital or receipts and dividends and that, in that respect, the resolution had been complied with.

In connexion with item 1 of the conclusions and recommendations, his delegation felt that it was not appropriate for the Committee to discuss the question of enlarging its membership. With regard to item 2, the first sentence had been dealt with in chapter IX of the report, while the remainder of item 2 and item 3 dealt with matters which the Security Council itself had to decide. Indeed, item 3, and item 4 also, suggested that the Security Council should take action beyond that provided for in the relevant resolutions. If those items were to be included, provision should be made for the inclusion of comments and objections as well. Item 5 dealt with matters covered in the Nepalese draft proposals and had therefore been deleted. His delegation felt that item 6 had been covered fully in Security Council resolution 277 (1970). It might be included in a section of the report enumerating points on which no agreement had been reached, which might state that certain delegations regarded the matter as already covered by that resolution and considered that the flow of investments to Southern Rhodesia from the countries represented in the Security Council had been stopped. Item 7 was completely unacceptable; if it appeared at all, it would have to be in an unagreed section.

The Committee might wish to deal with those procedural proposals at the present meeting and then consider questions of substance and timing.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) observed that there were already more areas of agreement than at the same stage of the Committee's work the previous year. With regard to item 5 of the Nepalese draft proposals, it would be difficult for his delegation to agree to the additional words "which are invalid". If it meant that someone in the United States could not receive mail from a missionary relative in Southern Rhodesia, his delegation could not agree to the proposal.

The present difficulty might be solved if the observations which certain delegations wished to make were to appear in the summary records - a procedure

which had been adopted the previous year. Such a procedure would in his view be better than issuing a separate section of the report enumerating areas of disagreement; such a section, being larger than that dealing with matters agreed upon, would make for a distorted report. He suggested that the report might include a note to the effect that certain members of the Committee had made supplementary observations with regard to items on which agreement had not been reached, together with a reference to the summary records in which those observations were to be found.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) said he supported the United States representative's procedural suggestion. In his view, it was important to try to reach a decision at the present meeting on the agreed section of the report.

With regard to the reference to Rhodesian postal stamps, his delegation felt that the matter should not be mentioned until the Universal Postal Union had had an opportunity to consider it. He suggested that the point should be dealt with separately.

Mr. TARASSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although the informal meeting had been exclusively concerned with the draft proposals submitted by the Nepalese, United Kingdom and Soviet delegations, the Committee, in drafting the last chapter of its report, might well draw on some of the documentation prepared by the Secretariat.

He did not agree with the United States representative that points of disagreement should be recorded in the summary records but should not appear in the report. The agreement reached so far on a number of points had been obtained on the understanding that areas of disagreement would also be recorded in the report, so that the Security Council would have a complete and candid picture and not be misled by a semblance of unanimity. The United States proposal was contrary to the understanding on which the informal meeting had been conducted.

Points of agreement should be included in the report only if points of disagreement appeared also. To include the latter in the report would require little time; the necessary wording was already to be found in the Nepalese and the Soviet draft proposals. Delegations which did not agree could state their dissenting views.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) said that an attempt to include the observations on which no agreement had been reached in the report was likely to cause considerable delay. The Committee should adopt the same procedure as it had done for its previous report.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said he thought it strange that the USSR representative found it difficult to agree to a procedure which was almost identical with that of the previous year, when Mr. Tarassov himself had been Chairman.

He agreed that the Committee should certainly not mislead the Security Council. He reiterated his proposal that the text of the report should refer the reader to the summary record for an account of the supplementary observations with which some members of the Committee had not agreed. That would enable the Committee to complete the report without further delay. The inclusion of the "unagreed" observations, on the other hand, might take another month.

Mr. TARASSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. BHATT (Nepal), suggested that, to save time, those recommendations and proposals which had not obtained general support could be presented in the form of an annex.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) agreed. In addition, the text of the report might include a reference to the summary records for an account of members' comments on the disagreed proposals.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) said that since his country's proposals had been accepted by the three delegations together with a small amendment, they could, if the Committee agreed, be fused into the agreed conclusions of the report and would not then need to be included in an annex.

Mr. BLANC (France) considered that the report marked a decisive step in the work of the Committee. The Committee had now completed its consideration of replies to general questionnaires and, as the records testified, was becoming increasingly absorbed in the study of specific cases of possible violations of sanctions.

The last chapter would necessarily be a summary of what had been said in the preceding chapters. It should indicate that, by extending indirect support

to the régime, some of Southern Rhodesia's neighbours were failing to comply with the provisions of United Nations resolutions and that the sanctions had not achieved their objective in respect of trade, immigration and investments. It should also state that countries able to do so should provide the Committee with more information and that the replies should be more explicit and transmitted more promptly.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) said that if "unagreed" observations were to be included in an annex in their original form, there would be no need for the compromise formulations that had been worked out. In particular, he would withdraw the two United Kingdom amendments to the Nepalese proposal.

Mr. BHATT (Nepal) asked the United Kingdom representative whether he would permit the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 4 of the Nepalese proposal to stand.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) said that he had no authority from his Government to do so. He would prefer to have the proposal given in its original form in the annex and omitted from the agreed section.

He agreed, in reply to a request by the Nepalese representative, that the Nepalese proposal, as amended by the United Kingdom, might be included in the annex.

The CHAIRMAN, summing up a short discussion on the choice of a title for chapter X, said that there had been three suggestions: "Observations", "Observations and Recommendations", and "Conclusions and Recommendations".

Mr. BLANC (France) said that the use of the word "recommendations" might mislead the Security Council by giving the impression that the report referred to paragraph 21 (c), of Council resolution 277 (1970) whereas in chapter IX the Committee had stated that it had not yet studied the question raised by that article.

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) noted that the Committee was in general agreement that the informal drafting group should meet to redraft the points which were still unresolved. The Committee might meet again immediately hereafter to adopt its report in final form.

/...

Mr. ORTEGA-URBINA (Nicaragua) wondered whether the Committee had completed its work or whether it would have to meet again to approve the changes made by the informal drafting group. As far as the title of chapter X was concerned, he was prepared to endorse anything adopted by that group.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was his understanding that the Committee had agreed on the substance of its report and that the final drafting changes would be made by the informal drafting group. The text of the report would be circulated to members and the Committee would meet again only if any member raised objections to that text.

Mr. BLANC (France) observed that a text which had been agreed in broad outline often gave rise to drafting problems when subjected to detailed scrutiny. The Committee should therefore hold another short meeting to approve the wording of the report and in particular of chapter VIII.

Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that the Secretariat had been requested to redraft some passages in the draft report and he would like the Committee to approve the new text.

With regard to chapter I, he read out the following text for a new paragraph 2:

"Following its consideration in March 1970 of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the Security Council adopted resolution 277 (1970), which contained extended terms of reference for the Committee".

The paragraph was adopted.

Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee), recalling that the Committee had requested the Secretariat to include in chapter I a reference to the fact that the Committee did not have available to it statistics on the trade of Southern Rhodesia for the latter half of 1969, suggested that the Committee might wish not to make such an addition in chapter I in as much as the point was explained in chapter IV, paragraph 18, which had been adopted subsequently.

It was so decided.

Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that the Secretariat had been requested to explain in paragraph 2 of chapter I why the submission of the report had been delayed. However, that point was explained in the paragraphs which followed, which had been adopted subsequently.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) and Mr. BLANC (France) saw no need to include the point.

Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee) said that as requested by the Committee the words "which include Southern Rhodesia's trading partners" had been inserted after the words "to other countries, as disclosed by recorded trade statistics" in paragraph 20 of chapter IV. In paragraph 23 of that chapter, after the words "it is clear that much of the trade with Southern Rhodesia is now being reported in the statistics as trade with South Africa and Mozambique", the following text should be added: "There may also be some trade being reported in the statistics as trade with other neighbouring countries. Accordingly the data set out...".

Mr. TARASSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the proposed amendment to paragraph 20, said that, as he had explained at a previous meeting, countries which showed increases in trade with Southern Rhodesia were ipso facto trading partners. He would therefore prefer the wording "as disclosed by records of the trade statistics of Southern Rhodesia's trading partners".

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) pointed out that the term "trading partners" was inaccurate and pejorative. There were countries which acknowledged their trade with Southern Rhodesia; others did not. In his view, the countries most to be condemned were not those which acknowledged their trade openly and applied the sanctions conscientiously, but those which did not. He therefore suggested that the phrase should read "disclosed in the recorded trade statistics of countries which acknowledged their trade with Southern Rhodesia".

Mr. HILDYARD (United Kingdom) supported the United States amendment. The meaning of the words "trading partners" was obscure in English.

Mr. TARASSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the term was frequently used in United Nations resolutions and had a precise meaning: a trading partner was a country which had trade relations with another country.

/...

Mr. BLANC (France) suggested that the text might say simply that the statistics in question were those communicated by the States listed in annex I which would be no more than a factual statement.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the matter should be referred to the informal drafting group.

It was so decided.

Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that the Committee had agreed to delete paragraph 5 of the draft of chapter VI.

He wondered whether the French representative could agree that the title of chapter VIII should be "Suspected violations of sanctions" as proposed at the previous meeting.

Mr. BLANC (France) said he could accept that suggestion.

Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 3 of the draft of chapter VIII would be replaced by four paragraphs, the text of which he would circulate to the Committee's members.

Mr. TARASSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) deplored the fact that although the Committee was on the point of adopting its report, it did not have a copy of the final text; yet major changes had been made, particularly in the parts dealing with consular representation, the violation of sanctions and immigration and tourism. His delegation could not adopt the report without seeing the final text. That text would have to be adopted at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that, in his opinion, the Committee was adopting its report in substance, leaving open only questions of drafting, which could be settled by the informal drafting group. He requested the Secretary to circulate a clean and corrected text of the draft report to the members of the Committee. If members had no comments to make, they could express their approval of the text to the Secretary; if they had any objections, the Committee could hold another meeting for the purpose of adopting its report in final form.

Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee) said that he would circulate a corrected version of the report, based on his understanding of the Committee's decisions, which would not be binding on members.

The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would consider that the Committee approved the report in substance, on the understanding that the final text would be cleared with all the members of the Committee.

It was so decided.

-----