

Chairman of the OAU, on the mission. I would stress, Mr. President, that in presenting these constitutional principles, the Contact Group has not attempted to write a constitution for Namibia. That is the task of the Namibian Constituent Assembly which, under the terms of Security Council Resolution 435, will be elected for that purpose. The document that the Five presented in Africa suggests guidelines for the Constituent Assembly and sets forth certain broad principles to be reflected in the constitution.

In the second phase, the specific arrangements for the United Nations' Transitional Assistance Group will have to be agreed upon. We intend also to make suggestions to help ensure that the transition would be conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

The third phase of the process, Mr. President, would begin with a public commitment by all of the parties concerned to a date for the beginning of the implementation of 435.

We are not yet in a position, Mr. President, to report on the reactions of all of the parties to the first phase proposals of the Contact Group. We can say, however, that the initial response has been encouraging. The Five are well aware that there are still difficult issues left to resolve in the second phase. But we are convinced that with goodwill on all sides, with patience, forbearance, and a spirit of constructive commitment, there is every reason to hope the negotiations can be carried through to a successful conclusion.

Another approach, and one which we believe offers no contribution in moving Namibia closer to independence, is embodied in the six-part resolution that has been drafted by the Council for Namibia. This document is vituperative in tone, unjust and inaccurate in its accusations, wholly unrealistic in its demands and unhelpful in the search for a negotiated settlement. Far from supporting or even recognizing the efforts of the Contact Group to establish conditions which will make possible the implementation of Resolution 435 in 1982, the Council's draft only takes notice of the present negotiations in paragraph (A) (31) in which it rejects what it calls the "latest manoeuvres by certain members of the Contact Group" to undermine 435. We can only view this misinterpretation of our efforts as ill-informed.

This draft resolution would have the General Assembly condemn two of the Contact-Group states for "collusion" with South Africa in the nuclear field. This charge is made in apparent ignorance of the true state of affairs as set forth in U.N. Document A/35/402 of this year, entitled "South Africa's Plan and Capability in the Nuclear Field". I would commend to the authors of the draft a careful study of that document.