

the United Nations for the Zionism vote. At the following General Assembly, Mr Jamieson also warned that, if the link between Zionism and racism was maintained, "my Government will not participate in the Conference to be held in 1978 on racial discrimination". And, in a similar vein, Mr Jamieson told the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defense on March 3, 1977: "Where there is the slightest association, or where there can be an interpretation placed, that puts the Zionism issue into any other question involved, my instructions to the (UN) delegation will be to vote against it". Mr Jamieson did not, however, refer to this issue during his latest address to the General Assembly.

Yet the apparent meaning of Canada's policy on the Zionism issue seems now to be lost. The two resolutions on racism passed in 1977 found Canadian support notwithstanding the fact that they remained in all essential respects identical to the racism resolutions Canada opposed in 1975. In explanation of last year's affirmative votes, Canada's delegate could only advance unconvincing rationales: "We are conscious of the concerted efforts that have been made to restore the Decade and the Conference to their original purposes. . . for this reason, we supported the racism resolutions". In addition, the basis of Canada's new support for the racism program was said to be Canada's "interpretation of the term 'racism', as defined in Article One of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism and Racial Discrimination. . . . This definition will continue to be understood as the basis of Canada's support of the Decade and will be one of the elements that will eventually determine the decision of the Canadian Government with respect to participation in the World Conference Against Racism to be held in 1978."

Concrete modification

Fine rhetoric, however, cannot obscure the concrete modification of Canadian policy regarding United Nations racism activities in a manner paralleling the European Community policy: Canada's opposition to "tainted" racism votes in 1975 changed in 1976 to one negative vote and one abstention - as did the European Community - and in 1977 to two positive votes - again as did the European Community. Moreover, Canada's new official policy formulation rings particularly hollow when contrasted with the fact that there has been absolutely no success since 1975 in removing the Zion-

ism issue from the UN racism program. At the same time, the passage of numerous resolutions each year indirectly associating Israel with racism and the racist regimes of Southern Africa leave little to the imagination regarding the UN's treatment of this issue. (It might also be noted in this regard that it was only the American delegation to the UN that attempted during 1977 to find some way around the Zionism issue. Canada, along with the West European states, wrote off the American initiative as unrealistic. And, as it happened, the American effort was a total failure. Meanwhile, the Americans continue to protest the link between UN racism activities and Zionism by absenting themselves from votes and declaring that they would not participate in the 1978 Conference on Racism.)

Notwithstanding this volte-face on the racism issue, Canada's performance at the 1977 Assembly remained essentially unchanged from the pattern initiated in 1973. In terms of official policy, Security Council Resolution 242 continued to form the centre-piece of Canada's perspective on Middle East peace and UN resolutions. Ottawa's voting behaviour also demonstrated a similar consistency with respect to the "company" principle.

Support for Israel

For over a decade, Canada's voting record on Middle East issues has been second only to that of the United States in demonstrating support for Israel. Yet many Canadian backers of Israel now find the continuing, though gradual, shift of the Government's voting policy since 1973 disconcerting. Ottawa's "second-best" record before the Yom Kippur War and the oil embargo was excellent, just marginally less supporting than that of the Americans; since the 1973 war, however, Canada's "second-best" status has, in fact, been just marginally better than the European position. Moreover, the recent drift towards "evenhandedness" stands in sharp contrast to the relative increase of American and European support extended to Israel over the last five years, when Middle East resolutions have become all the more extreme. When each and every Middle East resolution passed by the General Assembly continues to be "one-sided" - to use Mr Jamieson's phrase - many observers have difficulty comprehending the wisdom and "balance" of Canada's new policy for the Middle East at the General Assembly.

American initiative written off as unrealistic