

When announcing the Canadian contribution my Government indicated the hope that other countries would also be able to make contributions to the Institute for its establishment and initial operations. In March of this year, at the time of the pledging conference for all programs for Southern Africa, the Canadian government indicated that a further Canadian contribution to the Institute for Namibia would be subject to assessments of the operations and programs of the Institute, its overall budget, the future of its financial resources, and its ability to secure a broad base of support.

Unfortunately, our efforts since March to obtain details of the Institute's budget and operations have met with little success and we have, therefore, been unable, so far, to commit further funds to it. Other actual or potential donors have experienced similar problems. We understand that the budget had to be considered by the Director of the Institute, by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Fund for Namibia and by the Council for Namibia in turn, a detailed process which is no doubt justified. We trust, however, that the budget-review process can be speeded up, possibly through the development of a clearer understanding as to the role of the Senate in relation to the General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies and vice versa. In the absence of an authoritative document on programs and financing it is not surprising that voluntary contributions earmarked for the Institute in 1976 have not reached the original target levels. Nonetheless, the Institute is now in operation and is performing creditably. We expect that its budget estimates and supporting documents concerning program development will be revised in a pragmatic form to show its progressive development from year to year. We hope that, as in the case of the Trust Fund for South Africa and UNETPSA, there will continue to exist an Ad Hoc Committee for the Fund to Namibia of seven or eight diplomats who will maintain a keen interest in the Institute's development.

In respect to the organization of UN activities relative to Namibia, we have noted that within the Secretariat there are many competent officials working to forward the cause of Namibia. Unfortunately they appear sometimes to be working in parallel and it is time, we believe, for the Secretary-General to effect better co-ordination between, or perhaps amalgamation of, all sections dealing with Namibia. In this fashion the effectiveness of our joint efforts might be maximized.

We note that the present Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Sean MacBride, does not plan to seek a further term of office. We wish, therefore, before concluding, to express our warmest appreciation to Mr. MacBride for his personal commitment to the cause of Namibia and for the time and energy he has devoted to this important position. He is a political person and his term of office has seen its controversial moments. But he has brought to this job a prestige and experience in the field of human rights that have attracted illustrious personalities in all corners of the world to concentrate attention on the human, international legal, and political problems presented by the situation in Namibia. We feel certain that his devotion to the cause of a united and independent Namibia will continue even as he returns to his home, family and friends in Ireland.

#### **Question of Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe)**

*This matter has been debated in the General Assembly since 1962. Over 11 years have elapsed since the illegal unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) from Britain, and eight since the Security Council imposed mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia.*

*Initiatives by the then United States Secretary of State Henry Kissinger culminated in the convening of the Geneva Conference in October of 1976. This, together with the September 24, 1976, announcement by Mr. Smith that his Government was committed to majority rule within two years, gave rise to a degree of optimism that the transition could be achieved through negotiation at Geneva. The purpose of the conference, chaired by Britain and including Prime Minister Ian Smith and nationalist leaders, was to set a date for majority rule and to decide on the structure of a transitional government. During the UN debate, with the possibility of a peacefully-negotiated settlement then in view, delegations were anxious to avoid any initiative which might jeopardize those discussions. The debate accordingly assumed a considerably milder tone than in the past.*

*The Canadian statement was delivered on December 8, 1976, by Mr. Jacques Gignac:*

We have come once again to consider the question of Rhodesia. The Canadian representative in this Committee made an extensive intervention on this subject last year. At that time the outlook for meaningful negotiations looked bleak and unpromising. Nevertheless, the Geneva Conference has begun. While we are not yet in a position to applaud a successful outcome at Geneva we can take satisfaction that the parties concerned are at least still talking and we can give all encouragement to their efforts to achieve a peaceful solution to this thorny and perplexing problem.