

in our opposition to the policy and practice of *apartheid* in South Africa. It is an abhorrent system of discrimination and an affront to us all. We know that justice must – and will – come for the victims of racism. We hope that those in power will have the wisdom and foresight to bring about the needed changes in a peaceful way. And that they will not delay – for change will come.

We also share common goals with Nigeria in Namibia. You have worked with the Front Line States and we with the Contact Group to bring Namibia to independence. We have no other goal than that. We do not link the implementation of Resolution 435 to any other issue. We recognize Angola's sovereign jurisdiction over its territory and its right to live free from outside attack. We have condemned South Africa's incursions on its territory.

Our objective, then, is to see South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia end. We have taken our stand on Resolution 435 and shall continue to do so. We hope that current consultations will lead to its early implementation. Like you, we are saddened that in March 1983, that has not happened. We deplore the intransigence that prevents it. We hope that South Africa will recognize that here, too, change must, and will, come.

We cannot fail to repudiate such denials of human dignity and human rights, whether in Africa or elsewhere. That reflects a pragmatic calculation as well as a moral concern. For a world which accepted such practices without protest (in Namibia – or in Afghanistan) would be a cold and dangerous world for us, a world where violence and conflict would inevitably grow.

There are other areas where we seek to shape or change the international environment. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea represents a commendable effort to bring international order to the conduct of maritime affairs. The negotiations were thorough and comprehensive. They were, as you know, intended to establish an equitable basis for the use of ocean resources by all countries. None of us achieved all we wished. It is a matter of deep regret that some countries are unable to accept a convention which is a balanced and hard won compromise. I believe we should all accept the convention as the sole contemporary source of the international law of the sea.

Canada and Nigeria have long been involved in another arduous negotiation – in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva. Here, too, we should not falter in our efforts because progress is slow, and the decisions are not all in our hands. Progress towards arms control and disarmament will benefit every region. Both developed and developing countries will profit from reductions in military spending. Canada and Nigeria must work together to overcome the obstacles placed in our path by mistrust and suspicion.

I want to pay tribute, in this context, to the leadership given by Ambassador Adeniji in preparing the Second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament. We look forward to continued co-operation with your representatives.

There is one other major effort to alter and adjust the international environment in which Canada and Nigeria have been deeply engaged. That is the North-South dialogue. It has been pursued in various