national position. However, the same critics have recognized that Canada's votes were usually favourable to Israel. This conclusion was echoed recently before a Montreal audience by the Israeli Ambassador to Canada.

Let us now consider the record more closely. Canada's support of Israel at the UN has been consistent with the principles expressed in Resolution 242. We have done so not in a spirit of "Israel right or wrong" — an approach that would surely erode the moral basis of our action — but in a manner that takes into account three determining factors: the substance or content of each resolution; the context in which the resolution is put forward; and, finally, the effect we think the Canadian vote and explanation of vote might have, both on the situation in the region and on our relations with other countries.

My objective, therefore, today is to review the whys and wherefores of the Government's voting decisions on a few of the most substantive resolutions on the Middle East before the last United Nations General Assembly and the UNESCO General Conference.

On many of these issues we took positions that were in accord with Israel's point of view: we have voted against all resolutions we considered linked to the notion that Zionism is a form of racism. We have also voted against resolutions that singled out Israel for unjustified attack or condemned Israel on the basis of unsubstantiated allegations, or sought to substitute some basis for a settlement other than Security Council Resolution 242. There have been other resolutions on Middle East questions, moderate in tone and language and, we felt, constructive in substance, that we felt able to support. On others we have abstained, where we considered abstention would best reflect the Canadian attitude towards resolutions that contained acceptable elements as well as elements with which we did not agree. On all our votes, whether or not our position was the same as Israel's, we were, in our best judgment, reflecting a basic policy of support for Israel's long-term interests.

The overall voting score-sheet leads to the conclusion that Canada's votes at the UN have been, by and large, consistent with Israel's position — more so, in fact, than those of any other UN member except the United States. Throughout, the positions we have taken have been grounded in our opposition to any attempt to undermine, prejudge or by-pass Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

It is sometimes suggested that we pay too much attention to how others will vote – to whether or not we are "in good company", as UN jargon puts it. The record will show that this is not a decisive consideration; we have not been afraid to stand alone, or alone with the United States, on Israel's side when we consider that position to be right. It is certainly true that we do take into account the voting intentions of such other friends of Israel as Britain, the Netherlands, West Germany, the United States and other friendly countries whose support for the right of Israel to exist in peace and security has been as steadfast as our own. It is only common sense, it seems to me, to look at the opinion of our friends, when it appears as if they are taking a different position, so as to make quite sure that we really do think everyone is out of step except Israel, the U.S., one or two other countries and our-

3