

~~TOP SECRET~~

9 A
Declassified by ASD - 17/11/2021
Information removed for national
security and/or personal sensitivities

20/1/35

Defence Signals Branch,
C/- Defence Registry,
Victoria Barracks,
MELBOURNE.

Ref. No.: 2601/005

6th August, 1958.

GCO,
SINGAPORE.

Thank you for your GCO/13-1(Supp)-454 of 4th July, and enclosures. See also my 2601/005 of 1st August 1958.

Collated report on the history of recent MCP attempts to obtain W/T equipment.

2. The only part of this report which is new to us is the "Note" signed by W/Cdr. Sears. All the other material with the exception of Doc. 5 of Lot 202 which was dealt with in our 2601/005 of 23rd June 1958, was used in the paper entitled "CTO Wireless Communications" forwarded to you under our 2601/005 of 30th April 1957. There is nothing in Doc. 5 of Lot 202 which would cause us to alter the conclusions reached in our paper.

Resume of report on possible R/T link in border area.

3. This report is interesting, but like so much of the evidence on MCP W/T, is low grade.

4. Presumably, if the visiting CTO appeared in each case in response to an order issued over the R/T, assuming a speed through the jungle of 2 MPH, the first lot were about 1 ground mile away and the second lot about 4 ground miles away, the airline distances might be only half these. Even to get those ranges, in heavy jungle, it would be necessary for the transmitting and receiving aerials to be able to "see" one another e.g. across a valley.

5. We agree in general with para 15 of the resume, and would reiterate the comment in para 8 of our 2601/005 of 23rd June 1958 about the usefulness of DF. I think that DSB could not possibly undertake to search for voice transmissions - see para 22 of our paper referred to above.

Report on W/T receiver.

6. This seems to fall within para 3(a) on our report "CTO Wireless Communications" and as such is no concern of sigint. The locking of the controls, seems to reflect the opinion of the mechanic on the ability of the users to tune a simple broadcast receiver!

7. Referring to the "Extract from Minutes - Project Burong", para 2(a), it is not clear who is expected to do the monitoring. As we have pointed out in our 2601/005 of 23rd June 58, we would not be in favour of this operation, and hence do not wish to be committed to the provision of cover - particularly voice cover.

~~TOP SECRET~~

98

~~TOP SECRET~~

8. The implication in para 3 of the minutes that the MPC can easily obtain the transmitters, whether or not we supply them is, I think, false. There is plenty of evidence of the desire to possess transmitters over the last ten years, but little to show that the aim has been achieved.

*MS*MS~~TOP SECRET~~