

South Africa still seeks what it will never achieve — the reshaping of the region, unilaterally, through the use of force and without regard for the sovereignty and independence of neighbouring states.

South Africa pleads — as an excuse — the need for security. How can anyone give credence to that? The world knows that the challenge to the South African state does not stem from the situation outside its borders. The seeds of change are sown within.

These are all depressing developments because they offer scant reason to believe that South Africa is close to accepting its neighbours as they are and living in peace with them. Worse, the developments offer scant reason to believe that South Africa is ready to co-operate with us in bringing Namibia to independence through free and fair elections under UN supervision.

We're virtually back to square one; that's where we started this debate, more than seven years ago. This continuing impasse, for almost a decade, is a great tragedy. A peaceful and internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia would be a huge step for Namibians. It would, on the other hand, have no catastrophic effects on South Africa — quite the contrary; South African lives would no longer be lost for no good reason in Namibia and Angola, and the squandered expenses of that protracted and illegitimate conflict would be saved. The sun will still rise and fall on the Orange River. There might even be a smattering of peace in the region.

In the circumstances, it is difficult to see why there has been so much hesitation and delay. Even now, were South Africa to comply, the decision would be welcomed throughout the world.

The Secretary-General, in his report, (particularly in paragraph 31) recounts steps that other governments have taken to meet South Africa's professed concerns. Yet South Africa continues to lay down a condition — the condition of so-called linkage — which has no warrant in international law, which is incompatible with Resolution 435, and which has been rejected by this Council. Perhaps worst of all, that condition, by any objective analysis is totally unnecessary; is a deliberate obstacle; and is the cause of grievous delay.

We know, from the Secretary-General's report, that talks have been held and assurances given which go beyond anything required by international law. To hold Namibia hostage to what this Council has previously described as "irrelevant and extraneous issues" is palpably outrageous.

Back on October 25, 1983, the previous Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations was equally unequivocal. He said before this Council:

"The Secretary-General has noted that South Africa continues to make the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola a condition for its withdrawal from Namibia. South Africa cannot legitimize its illegal occupation of Namibia by raising other issues. . . Namibia should have its independence regardless of what happens or what does not happen in Angola." As they say, *plus ça change . . . .*

One must not forget the negotiations on Namibia itself. It is worth recalling just how broad and complete are the agreements which have been reached on the implementation of Resolution 435.

---