

January 17, 1964

Mr. M. Mangan: The following are some observations on the draft legislature order including, perhaps, more comments on comments than comments on the order.

First, we are not dealing with a politically deprived people. We are dealing with a group of linguistically, culturally, and historically differing people who have never known political unity except through the accident of foreign administration. I strongly suspect that many of these people even now have reservations about the wisdom of the idea of political unity. Moreover, they are not seeking territorial legislative authority; they approach it reluctantly.

Second, in terms of the extremely high financial subvention by the United States relative to the local financial contribution and the limited government required, a legislature meeting once a year should be sufficient. With respect to remuneration, I am convinced that the legislative burden in the Trust Territory for the foreseeable future is such that full time legislators are not required. In any event, the quality of the candidate does not necessarily rise proportionately to his prospective salary.

Third, with respect to the question as to whether the legislature should be unicameral or bicameral, we might keep in mind the ultimate goal of this maneuver. The goal is to win votes in a forthcoming election. We probably will not lose the election by insisting on a unicameral legislature but, after hearing out the Council of Micronesia, I believe we might win more votes by creating a bicameral legislature. If the Council of Micronesia does reflect Micronesian sentiment, this is the type of legislature they would prefer.

One of the parameters which we have to keep in mind is that the fact that the United Nations, whether we like it or not, tends to look on the Trust Territory as a future nation. In fact, the United States Executive and Congress have probably looked on the area as an embryonic territory, if not state-type political organization. Either view leads towards the path of development which we have been following.

Based on our conversation regarding embryonic nations or states versus embryonic counties, another approach is entirely feasible. If we are to reverse ourselves somewhat and lean toward a county approach, I would like to advance the merit of a suggestion made by the Council last November. While giving first preference to a bicameral legislature, a compromise was also offered as the Council's second choice: a unicameral legislature with equal representation from each district. If we look on the legislature as representing an embryonic state, territory or nation, this is unacceptable. If, on the other hand, we look on the area as a future county (or counties), the idea does have merit. (Members of a Board of Supervisors or County Council are seldom, if ever, selected on the basis of population.) We could easily convert the Council into a "Board of

January 17, 1964

Supervisors" retaining the name Council of Micronesia and granting the limited powers which a county government would normally exercise. In effect, these powers would not be dissimilar from the powers which we propose to grant under the draft legislative order.

Before any final decisions are made within the Department or between this Department and State, I suggest we give this a real try. It has the advantage of leaving open some alternatives for future development; the other approach is pretty limiting.

I strongly suspect that many of these people even now have reservations about the wisdom of the idea of political union; however, they are not seeing territorial legislative authority; they approach it reluctantly.

**G. Milner**

Second, in terms of the extremely high financial supervision of the United States relative to the local financial contribution and the limited government required, a legislature meeting once a year should be sufficient. With respect to representation, I am convinced that the legislative burden in the Trust Territory for the foreseeable future is such that full size legislatures are not warranted. In any event, the quality of the candidate does not necessarily rise proportionately to his prospective salary.

Third, with respect to the question as to whether the legislature should be unicameral or bicameral, we must keep in mind the ultimate goal of this process. The goal is to win votes in a forthcoming election. We probably will not lose the election by insisting on a unicameral legislature but, after that, with the Council of Micronesia, I believe we might win more votes by having a bicameral legislature. If the Council of Micronesia does reflect Micronesian sentiment, this is the type of legislature they would prefer.

One of the alternatives which we have to keep in mind is that the fact that the United States, whether we like it or not, tends to look on the Trust Territory as a future nation. In fact, the United States Executive and Congress have already looked on it as an embryonic territory, if not state-type political organization. Each year leads toward the goal of development which have been following.

There is a real difference between a system of states versus embryonic development, another approach is to have a system of states versus embryonic development and look toward a ready approach, a real move on advanced the merit a recognition with the Council that Congress. While giving first preference to a unicameral legislature, a bicameral one will be offered on the Council's special need for a bicameral legislature with equal representation from each district. If we look at the legislature as representing an embryonic state, territory or nation, we are also granted. In fact, after that, we look on the area as a future county (or counties), and that would have merit. (Members of a board of supervisors or County Council and council, if ever, collected on the basis of merit.)