

The wording of de Gaulle's reply is ambiguous but might be interpreted as including political questions for discussion. It is not intended, however, that Vanier's consultation should go beyond what is defined in my telegram of November 30th, No. 2213.

I suggest that you answer de Gaulle to the effect that the intention is to provide for consultation not only on co-operation of Free French Forces with the Canadian Army but also on all matters of mutual interest relating to the conduct of the war. It would be undesirable to answer more directly the question in the way in which he puts it.

41.

DEA/4600-J-40

*Le haut commissaire en Grande-Bretagne au
secrétaire d'État aux Affaires extérieures*
*High Commissioner in Great Britain to
Secretary of State for External Affairs*

TELEGRAM 3088

London, December 15, 1942

Your No. 2310 of December 12th and your No. 2308 of December 12th¹, Vanier's appointment. I have discussed with United States authorities here the arrangements for their consultation with the French National Committee. It appears that the United States Government have appointed Admiral Starke as naval representative to the French National Committee and General Clark as military representative. These representatives have in turn appointed two liaison officers, Commander Kitteredge for the Navy and Colonel Waite for the Army, who have day to day contact with the French National Committee. The appointment of United States representatives to the French National Committee gives them authority to discuss all matters concerned with the conduct of the war and this extends to the discussion of diplomatic, economic and political problems. In the phrase of one of the representatives, theirs is "a para-diplomatic appointment".

In practice I should say on the basis of our experience in this office that it would be quite impossible to separate the discussion of military questions with the French National Committee from other questions of a political and diplomatic character. Indeed, strictly military questions play a very small part in our relations with the French National Committee. It seems clear therefore that Brigadier Vanier will have to have wide and flexible terms of reference in order to deal with all the questions arising from contact with the French National Committee.

With regard to your telegram No. 2310 it occurs to me that, subject to your views, it might be as well not to reply to de Gaulle's letter. Our reply would only lead to an exchange of formulae which are rendered meaningless by the facts of the situation as outlined above, namely that even though Vanier's title may be