

03/05

State was **Office of Legislative Reference (Annual)** a **Special June 1, 1961** of the proposed legislation. We believe that this is **unacceptable** and that **nothing** can be done until such **circumstances**, particularly since we believe have been **Resolved and Civil Works (R.E. Austin)**

Recommendations

Political future of the Trust Territory of the Pacific

is concerned that we call Interior (like the State of the Office of Territories) and call her out

Interior has asked that we relax our ban on congressional contact on a possible **potential** **Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands**. We believe that Interior could really avoid talking to selected Congressmen about it and recommend that we tell them it is **not** **all rights** territory political future this action to **Aspinall and Jackson**, and

State, Interior and Defense staffs have agreed on the wording of a proposed **joint resolution** to establish a **commission to deliberate** on the political future of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The agreement is a **disgrace** since there is substantial disagreement between State and Interior on the **meaning** of key phrases. The big problem is with **"a degree of government"**. State interprets this quite precisely as meaning independence, integration (annexation as a State or part of an existing State), or free association (Pacific Area style commonwealth). Interior sees this phrase as covering a wide range of alternatives including annexation to the United States as a non-self governing territory, an alternative absolutely unacceptable to State.

Formal comments from State and Defense on Interior's proposed joint resolution are due this week. The next step is to get a White House decision as to whether we can proceed with the State-Interior conflict on probable effect of the Commission.

State, Interior, Defense and NSC (Chuck Johnson) agree that it will be necessary to get some assurance of passage of the joint resolution before it is sent up.

Interior will have a unique opportunity next week to test the feasibility of a joint resolution next week when **William Craley**, the Assistant Commissioner of the Trust Territory for Public Affairs, will be in town on his way to the UN Trusteeship Council meeting. He is an ex-Representative from Pennsylvania, who served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. We believe that it will be impossible for Mr. Craley to avoid the subject of political future when he makes his expected visits to Aspinall and Jackson and other key congressmen.

REPRODUCED FROM HOLDINGS OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

State has been opposed to any contact in advance of a Presidential approval of the proposed legislation. We believe that this is impractical and that Craley can't really avoid such discussions, particularly since two bills have been introduced along these lines.

Recommendations:

We recommend that we call Interior (Mrs. Van Clieve of the Office of Territories) and tell her so.

1) Tell Craley in on the general problems we are having in getting on a bill and suggest that he not make any commitments as to timing or substance but that he test the possibility of getting legislation passed on West Territory political future this session or next with Aspinall and Johnson, etc.

2) Let State and Frank Johnson (NSC) know that Craley is doing this.

While this is a proposal still before the divided executive branch, a legislative proposal along these lines is likely. We need to get a sense of what the Congress might do with such a proposal before we move further. If Aspinall is opposed to action now we would be well advised to drop the subject for this session or seek an alternate administrative solution.