

forthcoming and cooperative attitude on the part of the South. You should endeavour to obtain assurances that Poles will not be allowed to delay matters further and that appropriate instructions have been sent to Menon.

724.

DEA/50052-A-40

*Le commissaire de la Commission internationale de surveillance
et de contrôle pour le Vietnam
au secrétaire d'État aux Affaires extérieures*

*Commissioner, International Commission for Supervision
and Control for Vietnam,
to Secretary of State for External Affairs*

TELEGRAM 87

Saigon, April 7, 1961

CONFIDENTIAL. OPIMMEDIATE.

Reference: Delhi Tel 263 Apr 5.†

Repeat for Information: London, Washington from Ottawa, CCOS, CGS/DND, Delhi.

CANADIAN ATTITUDE VIETNAM COMMISSION

1. Since accusations of Canadian lack of impartiality have been made on several occasions lately, we think it might be useful to discuss this question at length.

2. It is true we nearly always support South in Commission but Poles always repeat always support North and their record is far more consistent than ours. We do not repeat not know of a single case where Poles have agreed to cite North whereas there are many occasions where we have agreed to citing South, i.e. for refusing the provide information requested, where war material has been imported without notification, etc. Moreover Canadian team officers are honest in reporting what they see during team controls whereas Polish team officers are apparently under instructions to lie about anything they see that might embarrass North. There are many team reports that contain Canadian-Indian majority statements on something team has seen with Polish minority statement that Polish officer has not repeat not seen things reported.

3. We have always refused to present the South's case or to support it where we have felt it to be completely without merit in most cases however balance may not repeat not be clear cut one way on the other and if we do not repeat not present case for the South who is to do so? With Poles always supporting North and Indians always sitting on the fence, South would be in position of a man forced to appear in court without benefit of legal counsel. Record will show that we have not repeat not been unduly obstinate in preventing (violations?) for South. What Indians appear to object to is vigor with which we have on occasions pressed cases against North.

4. There are certain positive advantages to our identification with Southern interests. As it is, South have often complained bitterly that Commission contains two neutrals. South has not repeat not signed agreements and has not repeat not always been convinced of Commission's usefulness. Our failure to support them on important issues might make them even more uncertain. By using our credit with team we can often persuade them to adhere to agreements or to cooperate with Commission where they might be inclined not repeat not to.

5. Finally it would be naïve in the extreme to suppose that in matters affecting balance of power in this peninsula we would do anything in the Commission to weaken South's position or that the Poles would do anything to weaken North's. In less vital issues also we are sometimes forced to take South's defence. In cases arising out of Article 14(c) for example do