<u>Mr. Wechsler</u>: But wasn't this a rather crucial moment in the life of the $\overline{U.N.}$ when Russian and American tanks confronted each other as they did in Berlin for that fateful moment when if someone had gone berserk we might not be here now? And it still seems to me now hard to understand how the general sentiment of nations like Canada and others not directly involved in this conflict would not have been that this is the largest emergency we ever had, which may occur again tomorrow or a week from tomorrow, and that it would have been so important I think for American opinion if Canada and other nations had spoken up and said that this belongs at the United Nations if there is any reason for the U.N.

113

1.1

۰<u>۲</u>.1

.

• - -

់ កំរ

200

4

 $\sim c^{1}$

<u>__</u>]

رد بر م

20

61

1 t. j

- 81

9مو منتخف ج ه من با ج من مربع من و م م م

· ()

2.62

۰۰ م د

11

. . . .

2.

; ;

<u>Mr. Green</u>: Canada did say that. But a great many of these countries were not interested in the Berlin question to such a large extent. As I said a moment ago, they have other problems and the Berlin question is a remote problem for them. It's a very direct question for us. We are directly involved. But for most of the countries that is not the case.

<u>Mr. Mali</u>: Is it also maybe one of the reasons of it is that the majority of the United Nations members wouldn't have followed the western powers in their stand on Berlin? At the United Nations which we are following every day you have a definite feeling that the overwhelming majority of the Africans and Asians and one might say some of the Latin American nations are not at all in favour of the policy of force and power and strength on the Berlin issue.

<u>Mr. Green</u>: Yes, I think that's true. As a matter of fact, every nation large and small has taken the position that it doesn't want war over Berlin. Certainly there is a tendency among the uncommitted nations to say a plague on both your houses, and we don't want to be bothered with either side. I think you're quite right. There is that tendency at the United nations.

<u>Mr. Davey</u>: One other problem is nuclear testing. Could you tell us whether you feel that there should be no more nuclear testing period, or whether the United States, in view of the situation, should conduct atmospheric tests?

<u>Mr. Green</u>: Canada's position for some time has been that there should be no nuclear tests - in the air, underground, or anywhere else by any country. That is still government policy.

<u>Mr. Mali</u>: Yet, in the General Assembly the position of Canada was not for a moratorium as demanded by some of the African and Asian countries.

Mr. Green: Oh no, we voted for the moratorium.

<u>Mr. Mali</u>: Yes, but in the voting paragraph by paragraph of this resolution you abstained a couple of times giving the impression that you may not be completely.....

<u>Mr. Green</u>: No, no, we voted for that moratorium. I forget whether we abstained on one or two paragraphs. As you know that happens very frequently in the United Nations. You may not agree with the whole of a resolution, but the test is whether you vote for it or not, and we voted for that moratorium.