

July 17, 1973

20
7,432,6

MARIANAS DISTRICT

03-030216

Hearing of the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Congress of Micronesia with ROTA GENERAL PUBLIC, on Tuesday, July 17, 1973, at 3:00 p.m., School and Public Library building, Rota, Mariana Islands.

Interpreter: Mr. Benjamin Manglona

Mayor Atalig: On behalf of the people of Rota, I wish to welcome the Joint Committee of the Congress of Micronesia. It is a pleasure to have you with us today in order to brief us on the primary purpose of your mission. At this time, I would like to ask the Chairman of The Joint Committee to please introduce the members.

Chairman Salii: Thank you very much. Honorable Prudencio Manglona, Distad Rep., Honorable Mayor Atalig; members of the Council and former Congressman Benjamin Manglona: Let me introduce our Sub-Committee members and staff. On my immediate right is Senator Edward Pangelinan. Next to him is the representative from Yap, Senator John Mangefel; Congressman Ataji Balos from the Marshalls; Senator Ambilos Iehsi from Ponape, and Senator Andon Amaraich from Truk. On my immediate left is Mrs. Evelyn Akimoto our secretary; our staff attorney, Mr. Mike White; and our Senate Clerk, Sabo Ulechong. We are pleased to have with us also Mr. David Maratita representing the District Administrator of the Marianas. We have with us also from Public Affairs Headquarters, Mr. Daiziro Nakamura, and Mr. George Callison from PIO Headquarters.

I am going to ask your permission to sit down and briefly explain the purpose of our trip. As you know, the other half of the Committee is traveling in the Eastern districts. They have covered Truk already and they are in Ponape; after Ponape, they will go to the Marshalls. This half of the Committee has been to Yap and Palau, and after hearing Rota, we will be going to Tinian and Saipan itself. We leave from here tomorrow afternoon. Some of us will leave for Guam and from Guam to Saipan on Thursday afternoon. Some of us may stay tomorrow and catch the afternoon flight to Saipan. I want to express, on behalf of all of us, our appreciation for the excellent reception we got this morning. We also would like to express our appreciation to the Distad Rep., the Mayor and members of the Council for making this meeting possible. The purpose of this trip, and all of these trips we have made, and we will be making in the next several days, is to listen and to learn the views and feelings and opinions of the people of this Island with respect to their desire of the future. Therefore, we would be very interested in receiving any documents, any statements that the Mayor and the Council members or anyone else may wish to present to the Committee. In addition, the Committee has a number of questions we would like to raise and to obtain responses from the people. As you all know, the Congress of Micronesia and the United States have been negotiating to terminate the ~~Trusteeship Agreement~~. Putting it simply, the reason is that the ~~Trusteeship~~

030217

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

~~Agreement was not meant to be permanent; it was meant to be temporary.~~
There ~~are eleven original territories; there are two remaining, our~~
~~ourselves and New Guinea.~~ It is the position of the Congress that before
we terminate we should determine what should take place. ~~One of the~~
~~questions we have been raising in previous meetings is should we accel-~~
~~erate the effort to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement?~~ Is the pace too
fast; is it too slow? Closely tied with that question is another one
of whether it is the desire of the people of these islands to consider
terminating the status quo, or ~~is it more desirable to continue the~~
~~status quo for some time in the future?~~ As we all know, the Congress
of Micronesia has been emphasizing free association as the first choice
to be presented to the people of Micronesia, so one of the questions
we are interested in receiving some response to is whether this is
what the people want or whether there are other alternatives that the
Committee should give equal consideration to? Under free association,
there are four basic principles which define that and which have been
guiding this Committee in negotiating the terms of free association.
Those ~~principles are~~ that the people of this island or islands will
have sovereignty over Micronesia; that we have the right to draft our
own constitution, form our own government, and amend them or change
them any time without asking anybody's permission to do so. Third,
we have the right of self-government, to choose independence or self-
government if we wish to; and fourth, that our relationship with the
United States or any nation shall be in the form of a revocable
compact. These four principles were decided to more or less put the
Congress of Micronesia through its own resort without consultation
with the people. So, one of the questions this Committee is interested
in raising is whether these principles are acceptable with the people.
Are they too rigid? Are there additional principles which should be
added? Should any of these be deleted or changed? As a result of the
negotiations we have dealt with the United States so far, we have
produced a document containing the beginning of what might eventually
become the compact of free association between Micronesia and the
United States. This incomplete draft has three titles: (1) govern-
ing internal affairs; (2) governing external affairs, and (3) govern-
ing defense relationship. Under the defense arrangement is an Annex
section which ~~gives the United States military certain land options~~
~~in Micronesia and other land areas for actual use for military pur-~~
~~poses.~~ We want to know what the leaders and people of Rota think
about these three titles in the compact. We especially want to be
guided by the desires of the people with respect to the military
presence in Micronesia. And, last on my list, but not the least by
any sense, is this question: ~~Should the Congress continue to nego-~~
~~tiate for all of Micronesia or should the district take all the task~~
~~of negotiating on their own.~~ In 1969, the then Status Commission of
the Congress of Micronesia came to Rota. At that time, we came with
the idea to sell to the people the idea of free association. This
time our purpose is not to sell any idea but to get the reaction of
the people to the whole question of our future. We will to the extent
that there is a consensus that we can obtain be guided by that con-
sensus. The next round of talks is now tentatively scheduled for the
end of September or beginning of October. They were postponed from
an earlier date because the people of Palau expressed their desire

030218

that before the negotiations continue all public lands in Palau should be returned to them. So, one other question we would like to pose is ~~what do the people of this district and especially of this island think about the public land; should it be returned to the district before the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement or what is the feeling of this island with respect to the return of public land?~~ If and when it is returned, ~~who in the district should receive the land?~~ What happens to the sites of ~~public facilities~~ such as administrative buildings, schools, hospitals, roads, etc.? ~~Should they remain in the Trust Territory? Who in the district should obtain these?~~ What happens to the homesteads that have been given out and the leases which also have been given out? Are they to be returned also or are they to remain with the people who have obtained titles to them? These are some of the basic questions we want to raise. There are more, but I believe that for the purposes of our discussions they are enough for us to proceed and begin the discussion. Before we do that, I would like to ask members of the Committee if they have any remarks before we go into the questions.

No comments or questions from the members of the Committee.

Mr. Distad Rep. and Mayor, we would like now to open the floor for discussion.

Pete Ogo: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose the question in relations to defense. We have seen it happened to our neighbor island, Guam. For example, there are some cases where the military would like to implement the installation, for example, gas. In case this comes into effect, would the people of Micronesia have any right to reject it if we do not desire such installations in our area?

Chairman Saliu: This Committee has expressed its position to the placement of dangerous weapons on Micronesian soil, dangerous weapons such as nerve gas, nuclear weapons, etc. on Micronesia. The ~~Title on Defense~~ in the Draft Compact ~~is not very clear on that aspect of the matter. What we envision doing is that when the optional leases are written up, that any controls that the people of Micronesia desire are best insured if they are to be put into the leases.~~ For instance, if we do not like nuclear weapons to be placed on the land area we give to the military, we might make it a precondition if we can successfully put such a term in the lease that "no weapons of this nature will be placed on this particular land." That might be a way of controlling it.

Julian Calvo: I heard that there is an attempt of separate negotiations in several districts. In the event that the districts want separate negotiations, what would be the position of the Joint Committee of the Congress?

Chairman Saliu: We have not covered the Marshalls and we believe that there has been a ~~separate status commission established in the Marshalls. In Palau, we asked the people there what they think of this idea. The Palau District Legislature (and the members of the Committee may correct me if I'm wrong) said that in spite of the separate talks, the people of Palau would like the Congress of Micronesia to negotiate for them.~~

030219

But, to come to your question, I can only say that if there are enough districts which successfully establish their direct talks with the United States, it might mean that there will be no point of further negotiations by the Congress of Micronesia. We, of course, that is, the Congress of Micronesia maintains that it is the single legal authority to negotiate. However, in practical terms, there is very little actual control that the Congress can exercise.

Alfred Apatang: What is the position of the United States to negotiate separately with the other districts?

Chairman Salii: I guess to answer it shortly, the ~~authority is that it can do it~~ and I think that the majority of the expressions we have had from the United Nations is that they consider the Trust Territory as a single unit and there is a legal interpretation which concludes that separation can take place after the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. It cannot separate before that. In other words that might be the reason the ~~United States has taken the position that the termination for all parts of the Trust Territory will have to take place simultaneously~~; that no termination of the Trusteeship Agreement can be effected with respect to only part of the Trust Territory.

Alfred Apatang: In the event that the district might not have the same political desire which in this case the United States can negotiate with the Marianas directly in this case, would it be possible to negotiate with the Marianas separately? In the event the current negotiations of the Marianas is concluded and the other districts are not ready to separate, under this political negotiation, would the United States be willing to go ahead and terminate the Marianas alone?

Chairman ~~Salii~~: I will refer to the response of the Trusteeship Council. In response to the question raised by the Representative of Australia as to whether separate negotiations should be conducted by the United States, the United States Ambassador responded that they will consider separate administration for parts of the Trust Territory even under the Trusteeship Agreement. In other words, my interpretation of that position of the United States is that if they conclude the talks with any district, the Marianas for example, and the other five districts have not been able to discover what they want with the United States, that according to that statement by the United States Ambassador at the Trusteeship Council, ~~it is possible that the Marianas can be administered separately from the other five districts, but that the Trusteeship Agreement will still be in effect even in the Marianas.~~

Mr. Taimano: I would like to remind you that I had read in the papers some time ago that it was your position at that time that you understand the expressed desires of the people of the Marianas. Is that correct? That you realize what the Marianas want and you respect all their wishes?

Chairman Salii: What I have said in Yap and Palau is that they have raised questions as to how do the people in the other districts feel about free association, independence, or commonwealth. We had gone down the line and

asked every member of the Sub-Committee what the people feel in each respective district. Unfortunately, we did not have Senator Pangelinan in Yap and Palau so that I had to explain that the reason all the ~~Marianas are conducting negotiations of the Marianas with the United States is that they like close and permanent association with the United States; whereas, the Congress is negotiating with a terminable, loose association with the United States.~~ If I read the situation in the Marianas correctly, this is the reason they are conducting separate negotiations with the United States.

Mr. Taimano: I am concerned with the term "sovereignty". I think this is a hard legal issue to understand.

Chairman Salii: You are correct in saying that this is a difficult concept and we have arguments within the Committee, but it seems that ~~under free association we can maintain sovereignty, that sovereignty remains with the people of Micronesia even though it might temporarily, during the period of free association, be somewhat limited. But, because under free association Micronesia is not going to be a permanent part of the United States,~~ it is our position that by that fact, sovereignty will be preserved in Micronesia even though, as I said, during the life of free association, it might be somewhat restricted.

Misael Atalig: Does sovereignty apply in Micronesia even though you indicated earlier that defense will be in the hands of the United States?

Chairman Salii: My response to that would be "yes" inspite of the fact that under these provisions, defense will be the responsibility of the United States. ~~Under this arrangement of free association Micronesia voluntarily gives to the United States certain prerogatives in the areas of foreign affairs and defense in return for other things that the United States would voluntarily give to Micronesia.~~ I am reminded by our counsel that there are ~~many independent countries in the world which have no defense forces of their own and which by agreement with other countries have defense arrangements and also there are other countries which have no defense whatsoever.~~ I think that in fairness to the critique of these provisions, I must point out that ~~there are some fears that under the provision on foreign affairs and defense it would be easy for the United States to interfere in Micronesia's sovereignty during the life of free association.~~ For that reason, we have in the Compact under Title II, Section 201(c), a phrase to the effect that "the United States will avoid to the greatest extent possible any interference in those internal affairs pursuant to its foreign affairs authority." In other words, the ~~committee recognizes the dangers of what powers might be used to interfere with the internal integrity of Micronesia and therefore a phrase was put there that to the extent possible the United States will not use those powers to interfere with the internal integrity of Micronesia.~~

Misael Atalig: We can take one example in the case of the ~~Philippines~~ where they are looking after the United States for their defense while ~~in the Philippines economy they are relying on outside sources.~~ They have people all over the world who have invested in the Philippines economy and that is why I posed this question.

030221

Misael Atalig: In one of the basic principles of free association, that of unilateral termination, is it the case that one party can terminate without the consent of the other party?

Chairman Salii: We have ~~not considered anything final on the termination part.~~ What the ~~Committee has proposed~~ is that during the first ~~five years~~ of free association, termination should require consent of both sides, but after five years either side can terminate unilaterally. The ~~United States' counterproposal is 15 years.~~

Misael Atalig: You have reached that decision of unilateral termination based on your research and study. I would like to ask how did you arrive at that concept of unilateral termination and do you see any advantages in it?

Chairman Salii: Unilateral termination is essentially a protection for Micronesia in that the United States cannot overdominate Micronesia during the course of association; otherwise, if it is overdominated, then Micronesia can exercise its right to pull out of its relationship.

Before we continue with the question, I just want to again emphasize the desire of the Committee that because of the limited time that we would like to have some expression of opinions to the questions we posed and to the kind of issues that are being raised. We want to know what the people feel, for instance, the question of termination. If it is not desirable, we would like to know.

Pete Ogo: This is in line with one of the questions you posed whether the Commission is going too fast or too slow. Has the Committee considered a timetable for termination?

Chairman Salii: We have no timetable set up and the Committee has not up to now set any timetable and that is why we would like to know whether the pace is too fast. Should we set a timetable, if so, what is a good timetable that the people will support?

Pete Ogo: I would like now to address myself to the question on land. We have been dominated by several nations before--the Spanish, the Germans, the Japanese, and now the Americans. I would like to ask the Committee that before we consider the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, we should emphasize that the land problems be resolved first before the termination.

Chairman Salii: I would like to know if you have any suggestions on how to resolve it? In one district it has been expressed that the land be returned to the chiefs in trust to the people. I want to know what do you think on that solution.

Pete Ogo: I would like to express my own opinion. I would ~~like to see a local individual given the trust to hold public lands.~~ I ~~would prefer to have an outsider who is unbiased and be given the authority to be in trust of public lands.~~ At the ~~same time, I am in favor of the Land Commission which is currently working on land problems to be entrusted and solve the land problems.~~

Mr. Taimano: I would like to emphasize further the statement made by Mr. Ogo. I feel that the land problem in Rota is somewhat a little different from the other districts like in the case of Palau where they have the chiefs. I feel that the ~~problem here on Rota is the lack of survey of homesteads, and does to these homestead.~~ I think that the ~~solution to this would be to expedite the surveying of lands~~ so that the people could be given titles to their lands, and if possible, maybe get people ~~from the outside in order to continue this work.~~

Senator Pangelinan: The question is perhaps somewhat confusing in our minds here. The question is what are we going to do with the public lands in the Marianas or in the Trust Territory? How should we return them? We have lands that belong to the people of the Marianas but at present are being held by the Trust Territory Government as trustee. Before the change on status, we would like to see that the public lands are returned to the people. The question is who are the people? Do we have a body or a legal entity to whom these lands could be returned to and that legal entity can take care of the problems for us?

Mr. ~~Taimano~~ I did not answer the question directly, but I was about to go to my other statement and that is why I indicated earlier that the first thing we ought to do, in my opinion, is for the Commission to try to find a solution to the existing land problems that we have. The second thing, ~~in my own opinion, is to have all public lands returned to perhaps the Government of Micronesia or maybe to a public corporation.~~

Misael ~~Atalig~~: This is my own opinion on the return of public lands, and I am proposing two recommendations: (1) The land can be either returned to the ~~municipalities of each island, and~~ (2) The ~~land can either be returned to the Government of Micronesia or to whatever type of government any district would have.~~ But, perhaps before we do that, I think there are other things that we should do first. This is my own opinion. I feel that before we address ourselves as to who should we entrust the public lands to, I think the first thing is to find out how do we solve our land problems now. I agree with Mr. Taimano that the first thing is to find a solution to the current problem we have on land, and then the second thing is either to give this land to either the municipalities or the Government of Micronesia.

Senator Pangelinan: We have heard about land problems. Can we identify these problems? What are these problems? I am asking you, the people, what are the problems? Do we want these lands to be returned? Shall we wait until the land problems are resolved? These are the things that we want from the people. Should we wait until the land problems are resolved in spite of having to wait 20 years or should we wait for the Government of Micronesia or give them to the people because they know their own problems?

Misael Atalig: I would like to emphasize that while it is true that in the past that every landowner know his markers but time has gone by and this has changed. ~~This generation requires that legal papers have to be processed.~~ For this reason, I emphasize that land problems be resolved so that the people will get their lands. If we have to give the lands to the trustee whether it be the municipalities or the new

030223

U
 government of Micronesia they would have to carry the burden on expense. They would have to hire technical people to handle this problem. ~~If we require the United States to resolve this prior to that, perhaps, it will save us a tremendous amount of money.~~

Alfred Apatang: I would like to refer back to my original question. Should the Marianas desire to negotiate separately and reach agreement with the United States and at the same time remain under the Trusteeship Agreement, would there be any conflicts that you would encounter, for example, homestead programs where the Marianas will have its own homestead laws while the remaining Trust Territory islands will have their own? Do you foresee that problem?

Chairman Salii: Yes, I am advised by counsel here. There does not necessarily have to be any conflict because if it is determined by everyone that public lands be returned to the Government of Micronesia, it is conceivable that the Government of Micronesia depending on the district might choose to continue the homestead programs. But, if the lands are returned to individual districts, it is also conceivable that a similar homestead program might continue. I think the essence of the question is beginning to make clear the thinking of the people here. What are the desirable aspects of turning them over to the individual districts or continuing to hold them under the Trust Territory Government or to hold them and return them to the new Government of Micronesia?

Mayor Atalig: I would like to thank the Chairman for giving me the opportunity to speak and I think most of the issues have been responded by my colleagues and for this reason I would like to confine my statement on the land matter. I must emphasize that at the present time we have problems in Rota for the simple reason that we have very limited land for the people to use at the present time. I regret to say that I feel sorry to hear that it has been 26 years or rather 28 years past that the land problems continue to exist and that also I would like to emphasize that during the Japanese times all of the private lands in Rota have been properly identified. I could say that ~~perhaps the land situation during the Japanese times are even better than now.~~ If anybody questions this I will be very willing to take anyone and take him out in the fields and show him Japanese monuments to indicate the markers. I would like to tell you that the ~~Japanese officials have been very successful in identifying these landmarks.~~ I would like to get to the statement made by Mr. Ogo earlier about having to resolve the land problems before we attempt to return the public lands. The reason why I say this because we are in a position now where we are working on the solution of land problems. We have seen several that have been given to the people and the thing that I do not understand is why are there times when these documents on land would either progress rapidly and sometimes very slow. These are the things that I do not understand. The Chairman indicated that in the case of Palau they have the chiefs while in the case of Rota, for example, we have the elected mayor, so in this, there is the difference. When the time comes when we have to solve these problems as to whom we entrust the lands to, I think we should bear in mind that the leaders of Rota are

representatives of the people and in that sense they can be entrusted with the lands for the people of Rota Municipality to hold for the people. So, I ~~recommend that the land in Rota should belong to Rota and should be put in trust to their elected leaders.~~ We have suffered in the past where bona fide persons in Rota do not have a lot to build their residence. Perhaps, the Congress of Micronesia can resolve this problem and I would like to congratulate the Congress for its action to make more land available for Rota so that people with families could build their house. This is all I have to say at this time and I would like also for the people to express what they have in mind.

Chairman Salii: I want to thank the Mayor for his expressions. We have some comments on the land question. We are interested in moving to other questions and some of them relate to lands. For instance, if Micronesia were to make land available for military use, we want to know how the people in Rota (of course, Rota has not been mentioned, but we want to get a fair contribution from the people here) feel about this.

Mr. Ogo: We ~~are happy that the military has no interest in Rota,~~ but as has been indicated in the military proposal, the ~~reason the military would like to take some lands in Micronesia is for peace and security purposes. However, I feel that by the presence of the military, it will endanger our lands and it will cause war and destruction instead of bringing peace and security.~~

Mr. Atalig: I would like to express myself in regards to the question posed earlier whether or not the political status negotiation is going very slow or very fast. Based on my own opinion, I feel that it is going very fast due to the fact that there is not much political education given to the people and due to the fact that we have different levels of education.

Mr. Taimano: I would like to address myself to two things mentioned previously. It has been expressed that we are lucky that the military has no interest in Rota. I disagree. There ~~are advantages~~ with the military presence. It ~~could expand our economy.~~ On the question of sovereignty would sovereignty lead us to independence?

Chairman Salii: Before we proceed, I wonder if we can invite Mr. Benjamin Manglona to express himself because he has been kind enough to do the interpreting for us. I would like to ask him if he has any questions or comments and perhaps we could ask Mr. Dave Maratita or Senator Pangelinan to do the interpreting.

(No comments or questions from Mr. Manglona.)

~~Under free association, the final future is not really determined. Free association may lead to almost any status. In other words, the question of ultimate final status is still left up without any decision. In other words, free association may lead to permanent ties with the United States or it may lead to independence.~~

Senator Iehsi: I would like to know what bothers him as far as sovereignty is concerned. The way I understand it, the Congress has taken the position that because these lands belong to us, we are the people to run these islands; and therefore, sovereignty lies within the people of Micronesia. So, whether you agree or disagree, this is the position that the Congress has taken. ~~We also believe~~, as the Chairman pointed out, ~~that when we get into the free association status, whether that status continues for 10-20 years, we believe that sovereignty should remain with us.~~ Whether that status leads us to independence, statehood, or commonwealth, this is not clear right now. The Congress believes that ~~because these are our islands we should have a voice on a house as much as we can.~~ I must also add that when you are concerned about defense of the islands, and you are implying that since the United States controls most of these things listed here, that our sovereignty is not full sovereignty. I must say that I do not agree to a certain extent that what we have given the United States is voluntarily given and therefore our sovereignty is not really damaged; our sovereignty is intact. This is my own personal interpretation.

Mr. ~~Bandiera~~: I would like to respond to the question posed by the Chairman earlier about the negotiation. Since we have the negotiations that have been going on at the present time, I would like to see this continue and if the other districts would like to go along with it, it is up to the districts to do what they want; but I feel that we are already doing our negotiations and we should go on. I ~~have confidence in the current negotiations.~~ I would like to emphasize that the current negotiations have to go on. I feel that it has many advantages as far as the future of our children is concerned. An ~~example why the United States is not helping Micronesia much because she is the trustee, but should the Marianas join with the United States, she will commit herself to help the Marianas and develop our educational system, develop our economy and all of the other necessities of our island.~~ For example, the United States has been administering these islands for the past 26 years and all this time we have so much complaints about the lack of developments. I believe that once the United States reaches an agreement, this could be all worked out. As for final agreement on free association, I believe that full assistance be extended to the people because they will have to oblige themselves to that agreement. As for myself, I can say that I am for this negotiation because in just a few years, I may die, and my concern is for the future generation. This is the thing that I am concerned about. It is for the future generation that we should try to seek good negotiations. I believe that there are several Micronesians studying abroad and for this reason I feel that the negotiations are in order and we have to seek protection for these people that are coming after us. That is all I have to say.

Alfred Apatang: The first thing I would like to say is that I would like to start off with the first question that was posed. The question posed was whether the Committee is going very slow or going very fast. The

030226

question is more or less like the United States Government when they ask whether we are going slow or fast and that is the reason why I would like to ask this question. Let's take for example the case of the United States to put her responsibility in developing people educationally, socially, economically and politically. In order to answer your question, I think we should get ourselves back and pose the ~~question to the United States whether or not their commitment as far as education is concerned have not been too slow and I think we should urge them to accelerate the development of education.~~ Now going back to the direct question you posed, I feel that the Commission itself is on the right track. I think the Commission is continuing its negotiations just right. The other question that I would like to respond to is whether the present system of government should continue. The answer to that has to be determined upon the conclusion of your negotiations. Also, you are asking the question about the sentiments of the people in regards to the military land requirements. I cannot make known my position at this time whether I would like the military to have land in Micronesia simply for the reason that at the last visit of the Marianas Commission, the U.S. representatives were also here on Rota. I then asked if there were any military plans on Rota, and according to the Ambassador, he indicated very frankly that there are no military land needs in Rota. I had told the Ambassador that Rota is considered a very beautiful island and for this reason I posed the question as to why Rota is not needed even for recreational purposes. Also, it is my understanding that should the military establish its base on Saipan, the military is willing to buy produce from Rota. For this reason, I recommended to the Rota representative in the Marianas Commission to seek agricultural development since Rota has been designated as a good agriculture land. There has been no commitment to such a request. ~~I believe in one philosophy that where there is a military, there is wealth.~~ I would like to encourage ~~the Joint Committee of the Congress to proceed on its negotiations on the other side of the political future.~~ Along this regard, I would like to urge the Commission to press the United States Government ~~to meet its commitment as far as administering the Trust Territory is concerned.~~ On the land issue, I would like to be on record that I would like the Commission to emphasize to the United States that the land issues be resolved, to give the people the proper determination of their lands and those lands that belong to the government should be returned to each municipality. I would like to see this problem resolved as soon as possible; that you seek funding in order to make this possible. You also mentioned public facilities, they should be treated in the same way as the public lands and that is to have them returned to the municipalities. Lastly, I would like to ask your support and your help with other problems affecting Rota. I thank all of you for this opportunity.

Mr. Ogo: On the question whether the Joint Committee of the Congress should continue its negotiations or should the districts negotiate separately--I would like to make some recommendations to the Commission to continue its negotiations if they see it is necessary that they be continued. ~~Should the Committee also see that the other districts need to negotiate separately, perhaps the Committee~~

030227

~~should consider this.~~ I know that the Committee has spent a considerable amount of money. I know also that it will report its findings to the people. I strongly believe that perhaps the Joint Committee should have its separate conclusion, and ~~in the case of the Marianas,~~ I believe it should ~~continue to work together for I believe that whatever they are trying to seek is for the general interest of the people.~~ I would like to indicate that I cannot commit myself at this time on the separate negotiations because there are still a lot of things to be studied and we are not quite certain as to how this government will operate in the future. For example, we do not know what the constitution is; what are the things that would be involved. For this reason, I do not want to commit myself at this time. I would like to comment on the four basic principles of free association, particularly the fourth on unilateral termination. I believe that this has merit because of the fact that our future generation will be able to change our association to whatever type they see fit. It is something that could be changed for a better status. I can only speak for myself and I would like to find the best protection for my children.

Chairman ~~Sarif~~:

I wonder if I can interrupt to raise a question because this has been implied during the last meeting of the Trusteeship Council, and it is a question that I know is in the back of our minds. It has been stated that the basic difference between the Congress of Micronesia's approach to free association and the desire of the Marianas people is in the question of termination and loose association with the United States and the Congress of Micronesia, whereas the people of the Marianas want a close and permanent association. The ~~Congress of Micronesia and the other five districts,~~ personally as I stated before, ~~desire a terminable and loose association and that is the basic difference between the Joint Committee and the Mariana Commission and the people they represent.~~ I think it is a valid question, and assuming that is the only basic difference, would there be a desire, what would be the reaction as you see the feeling of the Marianas people, ~~what is the possibility of considering a continued entity if the Marianas included any future association and if the other districts entertained the idea of termination,~~ there will be an agreement in the event that the Marianas at that time can go into this permanent association with the United States, what would be the reaction to this question?

Julian ~~Carro~~:

Perhaps, the Commission is better off in responding to the question, but this is my own opinion. For example, ~~we are in the free association with the United States,~~ and there are times ~~maybe in the future, say 20 years,~~ when the people of Micronesia would like to determine their future to open the possibility of another political aspiration, ~~should the majority of the Micronesian people express this, what would be the position?~~

Alfred Apatang:

I would like to elaborate on the statement regarding the control of Micronesia. Let us take for example the majority of the leaders of the Congress which is held by people from the other districts. I think that the feeling is shared by the Congress of Micronesia as for example relates to the problems of Rota. Aside from the local leaders and aside from the responsible personnel in Rota, I feel

030228

that there are other spokesmen who are really responsible for their own affairs. I would like the Congress to be sympathetic to the pleas of the districts making their requests and I hope that the Congress will not have any wrong sentiments in that respect. I don't want you to be discouraged and discontinue your negotiation. I would like to ask the question to Senator Salii to the statement made earlier that with this negotiations, ~~you did not restrict the Marianas from carrying on its separate negotiations.~~ In that case, I don't want to imply that they should be relieved of their obligations because of the fact that the Marianas has its own negotiations. I would like to ask your opinion since the Marianas is somewhat not properly represented in the Joint Commission. Since you have the authority of the Congress and you are entrusted to negotiate for Micronesia as a whole inspite of the separate negotiations with the Marianas, how does this separate negotiation affect the Joint Committee's negotiations?

Chairman Salii: We will come back to those questions after we cover the earlier questions. Let us say that 10 years from the time we start the negotiations and then the Marianas or other districts want to separate, would it be subject to the other five? Under the circumstances I was describing before I posed the question, ~~when a decision is made by the majority to terminate free association, all the five districts agree in advance that any district can break away from the other five,~~ that option under the circumstances I was describing has to be in the agreement. In other words, ~~the five districts cannot prevent any other districts from separating.~~ Now going to the question raised by Mr. Apatang, the sense of the Congress of Micronesia, and you made reference that it is the sole authority to negotiate the status question. I think up to this time, and unless the decision is made at some point in the future, this Committee will continue to negotiate. ~~Nondecision has been made to exclude the Marianas simply because they have a commission of their own. In other words this Committee is obligated to include the Marianas in its negotiations.~~ It is my personal opinion we have not made any decision on this, that there is very little that this Committee can do to stop the negotiations that are going on between the Marianas and the Ambassador. There is very little practical application that anybody for that matter can apply to stop the Marianas separate negotiations. It is my understanding th the United Nations Visiting Mission first included a recommendation in their report to request the United States to postpone the Marianas talks; it is also my understanding, and we have not had time to see the final report coming out from the Trusteeship Council that subsequent to that decision, the members of the Visiting Mission changed their recommendations and withdrew that recommendation in their report.

Mr. ~~Paimano~~: I ~~would like to have on record my feelings on the Marianas political negotiations with a close association with the United States.~~ At the same time, I do not want to imply that we do not support the Joint Committee simply because it is up fo the people to make their determination. For this reason, and excuse me Senator, should the people of the Marianas ask for commonwealth, I would appreciate

030229

it if this Committee would listen to the wishes of the people in the Marianas.

Chairman Salii: I repeat what I have said in the past, and I want to make it clear that this is not within the position of the Joint Committee. But, speaking as a senator, when we talk about self-determination for Micronesia, we also should talk about self-determination for individual parts of Micronesia. I would ask the members of the Committee if they want to pose any questions. I would also like to continue this meeting and I would ask the Distad Rep if he has any suggestions as to how long we should continue.

Mr. Atalig: In order to make a better selection on our political status, I would like to recommend that there be more political education in Micronesia besides what is being done by the Committee.

Senator Iehsi: It was pointed out that the Ambassador visited Rota and stated that if the military goes to Tinian, Rota will be the garden island in terms of providing produce for the consumption of the military personnel based on Tinian. Now, would it make any difference to you whether your government is commonwealth or free association as long as what Ambassador Williams promised you could be materialized?

Alfred Apatang: Should the military take Saipan or Tinian or either one of these two islands, there are still some questions in my mind. One, I don't know the figure on the number of military personnel that will be staying on Tinian. I firmly believe that should the military make its establishment on Tinian, I know that there will be military personnel but it will be in a very limited basis because of the fact that we have modern customs and nowadays it is just a push-button type of warfare. Because of ~~my anticipation that there will be few military personnel on Tinian, I assume that the farms on Tinian can produce sufficient crops to fill the military requirements on that island, and if that is the case, why do we need to ship produce over to Tinian?~~ I would like to give the Committee a picture that at the present time we are selling produce to the military on Guam but we are experiencing difficulties with the Guam markets. ~~The farmers on Guam are producing enough to supply the military and we have no guarantee for our produce to be sold in the Guam markets.~~ I don't want to imply that we have to depend on the military economically, but at the same time I know that the Commission has not yet submitted its economic proposal and for this reason, I think that ~~perhaps with the military's technical assistance in terms of production, this will be a great benefit to the farmers on this island where we could get more farm machineries and by that guarantee, we could have more productions.~~

Mr. Ogo: The Committee encourages us to respond to some of these questions that have been posed earlier. We have responded to almost all of them. My question now is how strong are these recommendations that we put out to the Committee? Should the people of Rota prefer a

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

status other than commonwealth, what is the validity of the people's preference when the people of Rota are under the Marianas District?

Senator Iehsi: I think this question is a very valid question because we can also ask what if the people of Tinian should decide to break away from the Marianas District? I personally feel that if that question comes up, or if the people of Tinian say "why should the Marianas District control the economy on Tinian" and then decides to break away from the Trust Territory." Under the present government, I don't see anything that will restrict them from doing so; it does not restrict a group of people from expressing their political desires and I think this analogy is now applied to the Marianas District when we consider the Trust Territory as a whole. So, when we talk about Tinian, we are talking about the same thing, the Marianas and the Trust Territory, except that we are talking about individual islands.

Senator Pangelinan: Regardless of the present negotiations, commonwealth for the Marianas, or free association for the rest of the districts, the final determination will have to come from the people. At the same time ~~we have to realize that the Congress of Micronesia is negotiating for a closer relationship with the United States, and we are all talking about another alternative, that of independence; so in the long run we have these alternatives of free association, commonwealth and possibly independence from which to choose.~~

Senator Mangefel: I am sorry, I know we are all tired. We have been talking about the relationship with the United States and we named free association; Marianas District is talking about commonwealth, and it seems that we are talking about the same thing, except one is permanent is one is loose. Now, if the termination part on the relationship with the United States is such that it will protect the rights of the individual districts from being run over by other districts, (and, I think the gentleman here expressed the feeling which did not answer the question raised by the Chairman) if the wording of the termination clause is such, that unless that district overwhelmingly voted for changing the clause, that it will not affect that district, what would the people of Rota think of that?

Chairman Salii: I believe it was Mr. Taimano who responded to the question when he raised it earlier, and his response is "you should ask the Marianas Commission".

Senator Pangelinan: Perhaps the answer requires a little time and perhaps we should look at the final agreement that will be finally negotiated. There is the question of money. Who will be greatly affected? There is the question of the constitution on internal government. I think this will require tremendous attention and perhaps we may find the answers at a later time when we produce the results of the negotiations.

Senator Mangefel: The question raised by Senator Iehsi, I am not sure that I got the answer. For the time being, let's forget about free association or

commonwealth. Let's just think of a relationship with the United States. If the people of the Marianas get something as the rest of the people in Micronesia, would the people in Rota want to have two separate relationships with the United States, or one Micronesia as a whole with the United States? What I am getting at is the unity of Micronesia; if through unity you get the same aid and economic benefits, would you choose unity or go at it separately?

Max Manglona: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is premature to try and attempt to answer those questions. I must inform you that although we heard about free association, commonwealth and independence, many of our people still do not know what they all mean. What we need is to educate the people and to let them know what are the advantages or disadvantages on the different alternatives. I would like to urge the Committee to provide for some kind of political education so that the people will be better able to respond to such questions.

Mr. Ogo: I appreciate the statement made by Mr. Manglona and now I would like to ask a question. Is it necessary that we have to become a free associated state, commonwealth or independence in order for the United States to help us economically?

Senator ~~Amarai~~ : I don't think it is necessary. I look at it in a different way, but I agree with some people that I think we can forget for a while about free association, independence, or commonwealth. What I want to know is what do you want in life? Then, perhaps, we can label it later on, but right now, what is it that you want? ~~I know that you want your lands back and that you are afraid of the military.~~ I don't know the rest.

Senator Pangelinan: I agree with Senator Amarai. We have put ourselves on record in identifying the many problems we have and how long can we continue to be in this desperate situation where we need our land problems be resolved, our need for economic development, and so on. How to much or how long do we have to depend on Washington to remedy this situation, or to the United States Congress to give us more funds to alleviate our problems? ~~I think that if we have our own government, we can handle these problems ourselves and we have to tackle these problems to the best interest of our people.~~

Mr. Taimano: I would like to request that the Chairman calls this meeting to an end. We have been meeting now for three hours and it is getting rather late. It may be all right for those who are light, but for me, it is rather uncomfortable.

Senator Pangelinan: I just want to remind you that we will be leaving tomorrow afternoon so we continue this meeting in the morning.

Mr. Taimano: I would like to make a motion and I'll second it myself, that the meeting has been too long and perhaps we can adjourn the meeting and reconvene tomorrow. I feel that there are only four of us talking and perhaps if they want to continue, we can do so in the morning.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Chairman Salii: I will second Mr. Taimano's motion. I think that we have done enough for today to consider recessing this meeting, so I will take the prerogative as Chairman to say that we recess now and in the event that we do not continue this, I want to express our appreciation to the Distad Rep, the Mayor, and members of the Council and everyone. We have obtained a lot of information from the people during these three hours. As Senator Pangelinan suggested, we have most of the day tomorrow. We are scheduled to leave at three in the afternoon. This Committee could continue meeting tomorrow morning. I will refer this to the Distad Rep and ask him what would be the good time to resume tomorrow morning.

Distad Rep: Mr. Chairman, the Mayor and I have agreed to reconvene tomorrow at 9:00 a.m.

Chairman Salii: OK, I will now declare this meeting adjourned until tomorrow morning at nine.

Adjourned at 6:20 p.m., July 17, 1973 and resumed hearing at 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, July 18, 1973. (Interpreter: Mr. Taimano)

Mayor Atalig: I wish to once again welcome the Committee members for making themselves available this morning and at the same time, we want to thank them for being here. On behalf of the people of Rota and the Council members, we want to say that we are grateful for this opportunity because the work of the Committee is of great interest to our people. I wish to encourage the Committee members to pursue the present studies being conducted and we know that it will eventually depend upon the people to decide for our future. Along with the studies being made, I would like to express a keen interest in providing for a better education in our political status. We are fortunate that we have at least two committees at the present time, namely, the Congressional group and the Marianas Political Status Commission and that these two committees are working for the benefit of the people, and as we all know, the final decision will depend on the opinion of the people of Micronesia. It is our hope that we are studying our political status for the benefit of the present generation as well as the generations to come. We should not think of what has happened in the past. We certainly appreciate all the work being done and I would like to again stress the fact that the people will make the final choice on our future status. I hope that the people in this room would feel open to ask questions which are beneficial to the Committee.

Chairman Salii: Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. We will now entertain any questions or comments.

Mayor Atalig: It is evident from yesterday's discussions that ~~most of our people are aware of what is behind commonwealth, free association, so that we need political education so that the people will be better able to decide what is best for them.~~ I strongly feel that the negotiations with the studies should go hand-in-hand. However, I

~~would suggest that we make the studies now and after the studies have been made then the negotiations should follow.~~

Senator Amaraich: I don't get that Mr. Chairman. What "studies" is he referring to?

Mayor Atalig: One of the studies being referred is political education so that the people may know what is behind the different alternatives so that the leaders and the Committee members as well as the people will know what is being studied. I would like to emphasize that the ~~important thing~~ right now ~~is to educate the people on our political aspirations.~~ Another thing, it seems that the Committees are negotiating now and after their negotiations then they go out and do their research. I feel that you must be well versed in the different areas and then go on with your negotiations. Along this line, it is also suggested that the Committee must be well versed with the problems in the areas in which they are working and after this is accomplished, then that is when the negotiations come in. It is my firm belief that studies should be made and the people must be educated on our political aspirations.

Mr. Ogo: I want to endorse the statement made by the former speaker that it is of great importance that political education is conducted to our people. We are fortunate that some of us know what is happening, but on the other hand, there are people who do not know what is going on.

Senator Pangelinan: I agree with what has been said by the several speakers; however, at this time, ~~we cannot conduct political education for the fact that we have not established our economic, social and political standards.~~ Until this is resolved, then a committee will be formed to conduct this political education among our people. I would like to emphasize the fact that political education will materialize when the time comes, but ~~until we settle all these problems, political education cannot be conducted.~~

Mr. Ogo: This is for informational purposes. I would like to find out if there is some kind of a curriculum established in our public schools on political education?

Chairman Salii: Do we have any teachers in the group?

Mr. Ogo: In the social studies class there is a brief presentation on the subject but not to the extent of what is the finding of the Committee itself. I think that the findings of the Committee should be made available in the classrooms so that the teachers could bring this out to the students. I feel that by the knowledge of the students, they are able to take something home to their parents and in this way the students are educating the parents at home. This is why I feel that this type of education be made available in the classrooms.

Chairman Salii: We keep running into the same problem in all the districts and we have asked ourselves what we can do as a committee of the Congress.

As explained by Senator Pangelinan, ~~we feel that political education is the responsibility of the Congress, but we also believe that it is the responsibility of the High Commissioner, the District Administrator, the Councils and all others concerned.~~ At the Congress, we do not have all the executive ability to design and carry out the actual political education program. We are ~~not equipped to do this,~~ but what comes out of these hearings, and as we run into more requests for political education (we are travelling with a gentleman from Public Affairs whose responsibility is political education), we hope to use the tapes and the questions that came out and we will report this to the Executive Branch because they have the mechanics in putting this program into effect and I am sure that we can encourage them, and we will make ourselves available to assist in any way we can, to bring this political education about. The Congress has created a Political Education Commission. Unfortunately, the Commission has not been able to function because there has been no funds available to carry out its function. We shall see next January whether the Congress could make the funds available. Because of the need for this type of program, it is incumbent upon the Congress to fund for this Political Education Commission.

Mr. Ogo: Yesterday, a question was raised on the public lands being held by the Trust Territory Government, and who should these lands be returned to. I would like to ask the Chairman what are the chances of these lands being held by the Trust Territory Government as trustee or having them returned to the municipality government before the conclusion of the negotiations, or before the actual status is effected.

Chairman Salii: On the United States side of the negotiations, Ambassador Williams has stated that all lands in Micronesia will be returned to the people of Micronesia. This Committee has taken the position that with respect to Palau, no further talks can be held until the public lands in Palau are returned to the people of Palau. So far that is the only district that has made a direct request to this effect. It is my understanding that the people of the Marianas have made the same request. I would say that the answer would depend on the interest that may exist. If there are enough people who are interested in getting the land before the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, I would say that the chances are good. Now, the question is who do we return it to? That is the question that is not clear yet. We have to consult the people of Tinian and the people of Saipan and perhaps after those meetings, we can find what the people would recommend whether they go to the municipality or go to the district as a whole.

Senator ~~Amarard:~~ I would like to ask a few questions to clarify some points raised yesterday which I did not quite understand. During the talks yesterday, it ~~was pointed out that the United States has no plans for use of land for military purposes in Rota. And, that is partly true if you read Annex B of the Draft Compact. However, under Title III of the Compact, subsection (c), there is a provision which~~

~~says that in the event the United States requires further additional lands for military purposes after the Compact has been signed that it will request for such land and that the Government of Micronesia would make this land available. Now, my question is, if this happens in the future and that there is this request from the United States for lands in Rota for military purpose, would the people of Rota agree to give this land to the United States for military purposes?~~

Mayor Atalig:

I want to answer that question very briefly. I am pretty well aware that the military have some good things and some bad things. One way of weighing the advantages and disadvantages is that we have been pleading here in Rota that our roads and docks are in pretty bad condition. The military, if they come in, could improve these infrastructures. One disadvantage of the military that I could say is the taking of lands. We have land shortages and our future generation may not be able to obtain lands if the military get them before the younger generations do. We can very well take Guam for example, where Guam was very much willing to have the military so that it could help out in the infrastructure developments, and it now has become so much of a problem that the military has so much land on Guam and the people of Guam are in dire need of lands but there is not enough lands now. That is why I say there are some good things and bad things about the military.

Senator Pangelinan:

May I follow up the question posed by Senator Amaraich. We now know that the military has indicated its interest on Tinian. Now, are the people of Tinian the only ones to listen to or should the people of Rota as well as the people of the Marianas, or for that matter the people of Micronesia have their voices heard with regards to the military requirements of Tinian?

Mr. Ogo:

With that particular question, I would like to put out something like this; and I am speaking strictly from my own personal opinion I think it would be most appropriate that the Joint Committee or the Marianas Status Commission would consider military land requirements only to the extent that the military would fully utilize the land that it needs. In other words, it does not make sense that the military request that much land when they are not going to use it. When they request for one hectare of land then they should make use of that land, but not ask for 5 hectares and use only 1 out of the five.

Senator Pangelinan:

As a taxpayer, there is no designation that the money you pay for tax should go to Rota or any particular district but it goes to the whole Micronesia. And, as a resident of the Marianas, my concern is whether you really want to express your opinion as a resident of the Marianas on behalf of the people of Tinian.

Mr. Ogo:

I really agree with the Senator's concern. Theoretically speaking yes; practically speaking, I don't think it applies. In other words, I respect the desires of the people of Tinian and Saipan; therefore, let them express themselves and do whatever they want with their own lands. This is how I feel. I respect somebody's

bedroom or anybody's house. Therefore, I do not want to make any commitment, this is a very critical situation. This is my own personal opinion. I have to give the honor, the respect to the people of Tinian and Saipan because they are the people who are most affected by this problem, and since your Committee is going to Saipan and Tinian, you will find that this is so. Needless to say, these things about distribution of funds, I think, are irrelevant to the issue.

~~Distad Rep~~

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had decided not to talk but there are some questions on land which are bothering me. I wish to point out that ~~the residents of Rota do have land interest on Tinian, Saipan and even the northern islands. I ask this Committee to bear this in mind. I strongly agree that we should all join efforts to find out ways and means to resolve the land problem in Tinian as a whole.~~ I strongly believe that the residents from Rota should own lands on Tinian and Saipan and vice versa. It is the present system whereby any resident from the other districts could establish themselves on the islands where they are interested be it Saipan, Tinian or Rota. It is ~~for this reason that I have some reservation about the land requirements of the military on Tinian. I solicit the help of the Committee and the residents of Rota to help the people of Tinian in preventing the military from holding lands which could be detrimental to the development of Tinian.~~ I would like to stress the fact that ~~the land in Micronesia is our sole wealth and we must protect it in the best way we can.~~ I strongly feel that the Marianas Political Status Commission, the Congress of Micronesia and the people should establish a good rapport so that we can develop ourselves to the maximum extent possible and not be inconvenienced by the military presence. Last I would like to express myself that ~~the lands in Micronesia belong to the people of Micronesia.~~ I strongly believe in this. ~~Should the military establish itself on Tinian, I would recommend that the taxes collected be fairly distributed to Micronesia and be shared by the people and not to go directly to Tinian alone.~~ I believe that everyone from this area should participate in the discussions affecting Tinian.

Senator Amaraich:

During our discussion yesterday concern was expressed by some people about the use of land by the military. Under the proposed Draft Compact on the use of land by the United States military, there will be no restrictions whatsoever on the use of those lands by the military. In other words, ~~once we sign an agreement for the use of one piece of land in Rota, then the United States military is free to use it in any way it wants to.~~ My question is ~~do you propose any restrictions, or do you agree that once the land is given to the military, it can use it in any way? If you propose any restrictions, I would like to know what they are.~~

Mayor Atalig:

Like I stated earlier, this question merits consideration by the people. I am not ready at this time to say anything in this regard. This is a hypothetical question and we are not ready to give our answers at this time. As I said, there are some good things about the military, but at this time we have to make further studies on this matter.

Senator Amaraich: I listened to the discussion yesterday but I am not sure I interpreted the discussion correctly and I would like to have some clarification on certain things, in which one of them could be put into a form of a question. You might say that this is a hypothetical question again. Supposing that what comes out of the Congress of Micronesia negotiations and what comes out of the Marianas Status Commission negotiations with the United States are not acceptable to the people of Rota. What do you plan to do?

Mayor Atalig: As I see it, I do not think there will be any problem should political education be implemented and that is why we need this political education and this will be the deciding factor for the people of Rota. I do not foresee any problem once the people understand all the political alternatives that are available to them. I would like to reiterate again that the people are just not aware of what is free association, what is commonwealth--it is all hearsay and no substantive knowledge on any of these. One thing I can say is that the people of Rota want to establish a close relationship with the United States. It is my observation that the people here in Rota all feel that commonwealth is a much closer unity to the United States and that free association is something different but there is no understanding on the difference between the two. There is a strong belief that there should be protection guaranteed to them. I guess I am being too redundant, but I want to express myself for a political education to the people. With my last statement, I would like to urge the Committee members to pursue their negotiations bearing in mind the best interest of the Micronesian people.

Senator Mangefel: First, I would like to make a comment and then ask a question afterwards. My comment to the Mayor and the people of Rota is this. Please do not feel too badly about not knowing too much what is free association because I can assure you that on this side of the table, we do not know it either. This is the reason for our being here and that is to find, to solicit what the people want that should be included in the free association choice, or in the commonwealth choice, or whatever the people wish. We have been emphasizing political education, but we cannot educate the people because we do not know it ourselves really. What we are trying to do is to try to define what is free association, what is commonwealth. I don't think we can educate the people at this time because we do not know it ourselves. I can assure you though that once this thing is defined, whether it be free association or commonwealth, when we can pinpoint out all of this, I can assure you that there will be a political education; we shall then be able to tell the people that under free association, this will be so, and so on....

Mayor Atalig: I wish to interject, and I am fully aware that there is no substantive issue on this matter; however, I would like to encourage the Committee that we have political education for the people and that the Committee negotiate in the best interest of the people.

Senator Mangefel: The second thing I would like to comment on. Last night at the reception, a gentleman approached me and asked why is it that this Committee insists that free association be terminated after five years and that the United States terminates it after 15 years. I want to make it clear that ~~we are not insisting in terminating anything after five years. All we are saying is this: that after that period it can be terminated if the people so desire.~~ We are also saying that if the United States meet their part of the bargain, and in our point of view, if we keep our part of the bargain, then the relationship can be longer; ~~in fact, it can be permanent.~~ That is what it is all about. I wonder if the people understand that same interpretation. I just want to make this clear.

Senator Amaraich: Under the Draft Compact, responsibilities in Micronesia, foreign affairs is given to the United States. I do not know whether you have had a chance to read the Draft Compact, but my question is ~~are there areas in Micronesia under foreign affairs which you think should be reserved to Micronesian government, or do you agree that all of it should be given to the United States to handle it on our behalf?~~

Mr. Ogo: To me, that is a very sensitive question; however, I would like to point out some other things. This is only my own personal opinion. Foreign affairs as was pointed out yesterday that according to the Compact it would seem that the United States would be responsible for our defense. Under foreign affairs, I hate to say this, but we have had an experience, and I do not know whether this is the kind of foreign affairs that the United States would continue to practice, but for example, the war claims, it is very sad to think that the life of a Micronesian is considered for only \$4-5,000. Unfortunately, in some places, ~~it seems that the life of a good breed cattle is more expensive than the life of a Micronesian.~~ Because of limited funds, the War Claims Commission had no choice but to accommodate the claimant with a small amount of money. It is very sad to realize that the life of a Micronesian is worth less than a cow. ~~If foreign affairs fall under the United States responsibility and this sort of thing continues, I don't think this is proper.~~ In this case, I do not feel that I can make any particular type of recommendation; however, I have confidence in my Congressmen, in the Congress of Micronesia, that they will be able to find something appropriate about foreign affairs, and in the future, maybe our elected leaders would recommend something to the people. To be frank with you, I am not familiar with the content of the Compact.

Senator Amaraich: I keep referring to the Draft Compact. ~~Under Section 202 of Title II of the Draft Compact, it proposes that the United States could have all treaties and agreements with other countries applicable to Micronesia. I wonder if you can benefit this Committee with your thoughts as to whether or not there are areas in which we should not consent to this blanket application of United States treaties and agreements in Micronesia.~~

Mr. Ogo: Isn't there ~~a provision in this Compact~~ that before any foreign affairs matters are considered, that they should be considered by the Government of Micronesia, should we have that government, so in this case, I ~~feel~~ that the Government of Micronesia should agree with the United States, and ~~but~~ think that the Government of Micronesia should consult with the people of Micronesia. Since ~~we have a body that represents the people of Micronesia~~, I don't think that ~~we have too much of a problem.~~

Senator Amaraich: The way I read the Compact, only certain agreements where the United States obtains the consent of the Government of Micronesia, but in other treaties and agreements of the United States, they could be made applicable without consent.

Mr. Ogo: I do not see how we could avoid involvement when we are affiliated with one of the greatest nations in the world. In other words, even though it will not affect Micronesia at the present time, it may be possible that it will affect Micronesia in the long run and in this case, I ~~think that the United States should consult with Micronesia.~~

Senator Amaraich: There are two things that I do not quite know how to go about finding out. One is that in my own district the people complain, like people in other districts, about political education or information about the status and when we call meetings for the people to come and listen very few people would show up and then one begins to wonder whether they are really interested or not. Another point, it seems to me that the feeling on this matter in Rota is that you don't know much about commonwealth, free association or independence, yet it would seem that from the statement made, you are agreeing to commonwealth status and it has been expressed that you think you don't know much about it.

Mr. Ogo: I agree with the Senator; however, I will put it this way: We talk about building a house and the Committee has a blueprint of this house, it shows what the house would look like, etc. I think the interpretation on this political education should be to the extent that even the older generation here who cannot read the blueprint would be able to see the blueprint. Now, I would like to ask the Committee if it is the free association alternative that they would like to see ourselves in.

Chairman Salii: This Committee is required to explore all possible alternatives.

Mayor Atalig: I wish at this time to take this opportunity to thank the Committee members and the staff for taking time out of their tight schedule to visit us here in Rota and discuss this very important matter. We certainly welcome your return trip in the future and continued discussions on this very important issue, and at this time, I would like to urge you to continue the work you are doing now always bearing in mind the interest and welfare of the people of Micronesia and we hope that someday you will come back again for further discussions.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Distad Rep: On behalf of the District Administrator, I want to take this opportunity to thank you and we extend our appreciation for making yourselves available to continue these hearings so that our people are aware of our political aspiration. I can gather from this hearing that you did not get all the information that you need and for this reason, I encourage you to visit us once again. I wish you bon voyage and a safe return to your homes.

Chairman Salii: I wish, on behalf of the Committee, to thank the Distad Rep, the Mayor and the Council members for making it possible for this Committee to continue the discussion of our political status this morning. I am sure that further trips before we make the final decision will be required and we will keep this in mind and avail ourselves to the invitation to once again visit Rota in the future. Our time is up, so we will call this meeting now to a close.

Adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Hearing of the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Congress of Micronesia with the ~~TINIAN GENERAL PUBLIC~~, on Friday, July 20 1973, 8:00 p.m., Tinian City Hall, Mariana Islands District.

Interpreter: Mr. David Maratita

Speaker Henry Cruz:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would like first to give special thank you for your presence this evening in order to welcome these visitors that we have tonight. Again, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to ask your indulgence and patience for this evening in order to accommodate all the questions that we will hear from our visitors and, of course, if you have any questions, we would like to have you ask them. This is all I have to say to you, and now, I would like to turn over the meeting to our visitor:

Mayor Borja:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Again, I would like to urge all the people present tonight to welcome these visitors that we have and, again, I would like to stress the importance of this meeting, and in all the conduction of the meeting tonight, I would like to ask your patience and your indulgence, and although we have differences of opinion, I would like to ask your understanding in this regard. At this time, I would like to give our appreciation to the Chairman, Senator Lazarus Sali, for his presence this evening and also the rest of the members of the Committee and the staff for being here to further the discussion of the negotiations this evening. It is appropriate at this time that since we have our visitors this evening, we want to present a resolution which was passed by the Municipal Council. At this time, I would like to turn over to Mr. Maratita for the translation of the resolution from the English language to the vernacular.

Senator Pangelinan:

First, I would like to introduce the members of this Joint Committee. We have Chairman Lazarus Sali from Palau; Senator Andon Amaraich from Truk; Mr. Mike White, staff attorney; Senator Ambilos Tense from Ponape; Mr. Sabo Uhechong, Senate Clerk; Senator John Mangefe from Yap; Mr. Dave Maratita; Congressman Ataji Balos from the Marshalls; I am Senator Edward Pangelinan; Mrs. Evelyn Aimoto our secretary; Mr. Paul Savercool; Mr. Manny Sablan our PIO man, and Mrs. Dianne Maddex from the Daily News.

Mr. David Maratita:

"Municipality of Tinian, Tinian, Mariana Islands. Resolution No. 1973. Introduced by: Committee of the Whole. A Resolution relative to expressing the desire of the people of Tinian to remain under the same political aspiration with the Marianas Political Status Commission and requesting the Joint Committee on Future Status of the Congress of Micronesia to recognize this desire of the people of Tinian. WHEREAS, the people of Tinian wishes to express their desire to remain under the same political status and in economic with their neighboring Islands in the Marianas District; and WHEREAS, the people of Tinian has the same cultures, religion and language with their neighboring Islands, such as Rota, Saipan and

030242

Northern Islands; and ~~WHEREAS, the people of Tinian has the same desire with the Marianas Political Status Commission to become in closer relation with the United States;~~ NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ~~RESOLVED~~ by the Tinian Municipal Council that its desire is to remain under the same Political aspiration with the Marianas Political Status Commission and ~~to have closer relations with the United States and is requesting the Joint Committee on Future Status of the Congress of Micronesia to recognize this desire of the people of Tinian.~~ PASSED BY TWLEVETH TINIAN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL THIS 18th DAY OF JULY 1973.

/s/ Alfonso S. Borja
Legislative Secretary

/s/ Harry L. Cruz
Chairman

APPROVED THIS 19th DAY OF JULY 1973

/s/ Antonio S. Borja
Mayor"

(The above was also translated into the local vernacular.)

Chairman Salii: Thank you very much, Speaker Cruz and Mayor Borja. First, I would like to say that we are very happy to get receipt of your Résolution No. 4. Because we have just received the resolution this evening, I am not prepared to give you any response. I will say this, however that we will give this resolution and the desires of the people of Tinian due consideration and at the appropriate time, and after giving careful study of this resolution as the case may be, the people of Tinian, through their Mayor and Council Speaker, will be advised of the official action of the Committee on the resolution. I will say, however, that it is the intent of this Committee to be guided by the desires of the people as they are expressed and I am glad to see that in this resolution we have had the first clear official expression made to the Committee throughout these hearings to date.

By now, you probably know why this Committee is travelling. I have indicated that we came here to listen to your views and to your desires. We have some questions that are intended to clarify the work that we are doing. Unlike the first trip we made to Tinian some six years ago where we came with the embryonic idea of free association more or less to sell to your people of this island, this time we came to find your desires and to reflect them on our deliberations and our thinking as we continue to negotiate with the United States to resolve the question of our future. ~~We want to hear your views on the use of your islands for military purposes for one thing. We want to know your views on who do you think should negotiate the use of your lands.~~ We want to know who do you consider your proper spokesman with regards to the future of Tinian. We want to know if there are things that this Committee or the Congress of Micronesia is doing on behalf of the people of Tinian which we should not be doing and by the same token, are there things that we have not done in the

past that we should be doing on behalf of the people of Tinian. In some districts, we have been asked to help return all public lands to the people before any discussion takes place with regard to the possibility of making land available to the military. We want to know what you think of this proposal. In the event that you decide to make land on Tinian available to the military, we would like to know whether you want to directly negotiate with the United States the terms of leases or whether you want somebody else or jointly with anybody else to help negotiate those terms. This Committee acting on the mandate given to it by the Congress of Micronesia has been negotiating mainly for what we have called free association. It doesn't matter that much what we call it, the question we are interested in at this time is do you wish when you go to the ballot to make only one choice on the ballot be it commonwealth, free association or independence, or would it be more desirable in your point of view to have more than one choice on the ballot. Another question we would like to receive your reaction to is whether or not the government we have today, the status quo, is not a good alternative to continue. Whether the people agree with the Congress that the Trusteeship should be terminated. If we continue to try to terminate it, is the pace too fast or is it too slow? There are other questions we may want to raise, but I believe that what I have cited will give you an idea of the kind of information we want to obtain. As I said in the beginning, we are here to listen to your views and to your desires. Please do not hesitate to let us know your feelings; that is the only way we know that your views can be taken into consideration in our deliberations. Before we go into the questions, I would like once again to thank the Speaker and the Mayor and to you especially for coming tonight. You may from time to time be tired of attending meetings of this nature, especially when many of them take place on a short space of time, but as I said, it is essential for us to know your views and your desires. I would like now to ask each member of the Committee if they have any statement to make before we proceed.

Senator Pangelinan: Ladies and gentlemen, briefly, I would like to express the understanding of everyone here as you have shown the Marianas Political Status Commission on its visit here. I would like to also to ask for your indulgence and patience. I am representing the Joint Committee on Future Status this evening, and I hope that we can continue this dialogue in future negotiations, and I would like to ask for all the courtesy you can give this evening.

Honorable ~~Mangloza~~
(Marianas DL) I would like to show appreciation to Senator Salii and his colleagues for their presence this evening. As for myself, ~~I am in support of Resolution No. 4~~ adopted by the Municipal Council and the Mayor of Tinian. It has been expressed in the past the desires of the people of Tinian to have close relationship with the United States, and I would like to take this time to ~~urge the Joint Committee on Future Status to give its support~~ in the desires of the people of Tinian as again manifested in this resolution.

Speaker Henry Cruz: Senator Salii and the rest of the Committee members, I regret of what I have to say but I will again have to say that ~~I am in support of Resolution No. 4~~ and the presently expressed wishes of the people of

Tinian. I will again ~~ask the Committee to consider this resolution~~

Mayor ~~Barja:~~

Senator Salii and the rest of the Committee members, as has been the practice here in the Municipality of Tinian, and this is attested to with the present membership of two of our members in the Status Commission, that whenever there is going to be an official undertaking here on Tinian, it is the Municipal Council and the rest of the Tinian leaders who usually would meet to discuss the situation, and at a recent visit of the personal representative of the President of the United States, it was expressed that whenever there is going to be something of a choice to be undertaken here in the Marianas, that there should be various alternatives from which the people may choose in the plebiscite. It is essential that there must be something of a plebiscite in order to determine the future of the people. In other words, I would like to say this, that I give credit to the previous administrations of the Trust Territory from the Spanish, the Germans, the Japanese, and now we have the present administrator and through the Congress of Micronesia, we know that we have been receiving assistance throughout the Municipality, but ~~there must be some sort of a referendum for the people here in Tinian to express themselves. There has been a formal presentation from the people of Tinian to the Congress of Micronesia which we hope is a way of expressing the feelings of the people of Tinian.~~

Francisco Cabrera:

First of all, I would like to extend my appreciation to the Chairman and the rest of the Committee members for being here this evening, and to continue on, I would like to say this, that perhaps there might be some confusion or misunderstanding as to the purpose of the Committee's being here, that is whether or not they are going to ask questions or we are going to ask questions, and this may confuse some of the people in the understanding of the purpose of the Committee. I would like to say that the Congress of Micronesia has the responsibility of the overall problems in the Trust Territory Government and that this Joint Committee has the responsibility to further carry out the desires of the Congress or whatever nature that might be of interest to the future of Micronesia. I would like to ask of everyone to give full cooperation to this Committee and to ask questions if you have any so that the Committee may have something of a viewpoint from the people of Tinian so that they may have some to present in its further discussions and again I would like to ask each of you for your full cooperation.

Mayor ~~Barja:~~

One of the greatest protections for the people of Micronesia is a constitution and we would like to ask if the Committee could make a copy available to the people of Tinian. As Mayor, I would like to ~~ask the Committee for a study and review of this constitution~~ so that everyone here may understand the content of the draft constitution.

Chairman Salii:

The ~~Committee~~, at the moment, ~~has no draft constitution.~~ Let me briefly summarize the actions that have been taken to date on the constitution. During the Special Session in Ponape last August and again during the last regular session of Congress in January-February, a bill was introduced calling for a constitutional convention for Micronesia. The bill was not passed during the last two sessions of Congress.

030245

Mayor Borja: We are glad to know that there has been an undertaking by the Congress for a draft constitution, and I would like to urge again the Committee that if there is such a constitution adopted by the Congress of Micronesia, that this same constitution be forwarded to the people so that the people may have the chance to look at it and understand what is in the constitution.

Ms. ~~King~~: I understand that this Committee has recommended the free association concept. Now, I would like to ask the Committee to ~~please explain~~ to the people of Tinian the ~~term "free association"~~.

Chairman Salii: I will explain and at the same time I will ask the members of the Committee to listen to my explanation and supplement what I am going to present. I would like to explain in the first place that the reason we use labels to describe a particular type of political relationship is simply to make it easy to refer to one type as opposed to other types. First of all, before I go to the actual explanation of free association, let me say that it is guided by four principles and in effect these four principles define in broad terms what this thing we call "free association" is about. The first is that the people of Micronesia have the right of self-determination and because we have this right of self-determination, we can choose any political status we want--independence or self-government in association with any nation in the world or with any group of nations in the world. The other is that the people of Micronesia have the right to form their own government; they have the right to write their own constitution, and to change that constitution or government at any time they want. And another is that if we choose to associate with any other country, we have the right to terminate that association in the future. I believe it is the feeling of the Congress that if it were possible for these islands to be economically independent, that the first choice of the Congress would be independence. ~~But because we cannot be economically independent at present we should look for a status that will give us first internal self-government and at the same time guarantee some measure of financial assistance to the people of Micronesia.~~ I believe it is the view of the Congress that ~~the only way to develop the economy of these islands to the extent and the direction that will benefit the people of Micronesia is for us Micronesians to have control of our government.~~ Therefore, given control of internal self-government and given assurance of some financial assistance and other assistance from the outside, ~~it is possible that we will bring ourselves up to a level when we can start to talk about the possibility of independence or other status.~~ And, therefore, in the view of the Congress, it is essential to maintain the right to terminate any relationship we may establish with the United States or any other country. So, you might say that ~~the unique feature of free association is that it can be terminated or changed in the future.~~ But, you cannot have a political association with the United States or any country simply based on these four principles or any other. You have to have something more in order for us to have a meaningful relationship. In other words, we have to define it, we have to put these four principles into actual agreement between us and the United States. During the last three years, this

030246

Committee and Ambassador Williams have been trying to define free association. Therefore, there is no existing definition of free association, no relationship of this type exists in the world today, actually. That is why it is meaningful and essential for this Committee and the Congress to consult with the people to get their desires in order for us to take them into consideration as we continue to define free association. So far we have been able to present three titles into an agreement that will further define free association and these titles cover internal affairs, foreign affairs, and defense requirements. Before we are through with this definition, we should have provisions on finance arrangement, we should have a provision on trade and commerce, we should have a provision on immigration and travel.

Ms. King: From what I have heard, only the advantages are being mentioned by you as Chairman, but what are the disadvantages, if any?

Chairman Salii: There are quite a few ~~important~~ ~~disadvantages~~. I am going to enumerate them. ~~First~~ is that under free association we will ~~no longer have the United Nations to review the performance of the Administering Authority~~ and to assist us in getting our complaints to the United States. In other words, as a very small nation, we have to deal on an equal term with one of the big and powerful nations in the world. Actually, aside from what we can negotiate, before we go into free association, the ~~United States will no longer be obligated under the United Nations to develop us politically, economically, socially and educationally.~~ Third, because the relationship can be terminated, the ~~United States can think in this manner: "Why should we give you a lot of assistance when in the future you can tell us to go home from Micronesia?"~~

Senator Pangelinan: Mr. Chairman, one of the important features is that the United States will have responsibility for external affairs and the internal affairs will rest entirely on Micronesia.

Chairman Salii: ~~Depending on whether we look at it plus or minus -- the United States will have full power in external affairs and defense and under defense, we, as part of the bargain to go into free association, would have to make land and ocean areas available for military purposes.~~

Hon. Manglona: In respect to the question raised by Senator Salii on how we should negotiate for the use of the land by the military--I would like to say that the resolution which was just presented has expressed that the people of Tinian has confidence in the Marianas Political Status Commission, and with that confidence, that all discussions in the negotiations including land, and if necessary land for the military, should be negotiated by the Marianas Status Commission for the people of Tinian.

Francisco Cabrera: As I understand it personally, the question put out by Senator Salii, is that the question he would like to ask the people, that it is not to answer the question as to whether or not the military or the people of Tinian will provide land for the military, but rather he is asking the question for the people to let them know how the land in

030247

Tinian should be used by the military.

Chairman Salii: That is the question that I will come to later on. If the people of Tinian decide to make land available for military use, are there any restrictions which they might want to place on military activities here taking into consideration the expressions made and the resolution that the Marianas Commission will speak for the people of Tinian? I think that since this Committee is also negotiating with the U.S. I do not think it would be unwise or to the disadvantage of the people of Tinian if this Committee is also aware of the desires of these people. At this point, I do not know how this will eventually be handled, but we pose the question as we go to every district in Micronesia. Are there any restrictions they may want to place on their land for military purposes if they agree that land should be available to the military?

Ms. King: This is my own personal opinion, and I am sure that not everybody will agree, but I would like to let the Committee know that since the people of Tinian are the rightful owners of Tinian, that they must first be given the privilege or right to have their homesteads and settle all land problems before giving the military land needs.

Mr. Fleming: I would like to know why the Joint Committee chose free association as an alternative rather than commonwealth.

Chairman Salii: The Congress felt that the ~~specific commonwealth offer~~ which was ~~presented to the Congress in 1970~~ was ~~too restricting on the rights of Micronesia~~; that ~~most of the powers of government would be controlled by the United States~~; that ~~we will in effect have permanent ties with the United States~~. Not enough powers of internal government were given under that specific commonwealth offer. ~~We would have become a permanent possession of the United States~~. We have documented the reasons for this, this is the report to the Third Regular Session in 1970. It has the analysis of that commonwealth offer and the reason why the Congress turned it down, but it is essentially what I have explained. I think that explains why the ~~difference between the other five districts and the Marianas~~ and I believe it is in that close association as opposed to a loose and terminable relationship. ~~What the Congress wanted and continues to want is a loose association with the United States~~. As I understand the Marianas situation, they want a close and permanent association with the United States.

Leonardo Diaz: I would like first to extend my appreciation to the Chairman and members of the Joint Committee for their coming here. As a member of the Municipal Council of Tinian I would like to again urge the Committee to support the resolution that was adopted and presented to the Committee, Resolution No. 4, and I would like to urge the Committee especially to make and consider this resolution as being the expressed wishes of the people of Tinian. I would like to ask Senator Salii regarding the matter of land between the United States and the responsibilities of the United Nations and I would like to ask the Senator whether the Congress of Micronesia should involve itself over the negotiations of the land of Tinian between the United States and the Marianas. I would like to let the Committee know that if they

have authority, that I am in favor of the military coming to Tinian, but to refrain from taking the land that is considered as the present retention areas here on Tinian. I welcome the military 100 per cent but I would like them to refrain from taking the present retention areas as is indicated at the present time. I would like to let the Committee know that whatever discussions or negotiations there are between the United States and also the United Nations on the present Village of San Jose here on Tinian, that we would like to urge the Committee to help us in any way it can. Lastly, there has not been any official referendum or plebiscite regarding the status of the people of Tinian and for that matter, the people of Micronesia and I would like to urge the Congress that when the time comes for this that it gives the most favorable consideration to the people of Tinian.

Chairman Salii: I want to thank the Vice-Speaker for his expressions. I believe I raised the question with regard to land and the authority of the Congress. I believe that under our laws today the Trust Territory Government has trust over the so-called public lands in Micronesia. I will have to refer to counsel and other members of the Committee with respect to the retention areas whether the Trust Territory Government or the Congress has authority over those areas. It has been expressed to me that the military retention areas are Trust Territory public lands which have been leased by the Trust Territory Government to the military and under the terms of the leases governs the use of those retention areas so that the Trust Territory Government has no more control over those retention areas as any other landholder who leases his land to somebody else except as governed by the terms of the leases.

Ms. King: I understand that Senator Salii says that the present land as retention lands are leased by the military but where is the fee for the lease of those lands?

Chairman Salii: I am advised that the leases--let me put it this way. It is in effect the same government negotiating with itself when you talk of the Trust Territory Government and the Defense Department so that any payment would have to be minimal.

Ms. King: I know that the lands have been leased and it would be quite substantial because it was right after the war when the lease took effect and I would like to know how much have been collected from the lease of the lands.

Chairman Salii: As in the case of all public lands any payment from the lease would have to go to the Trust Territory Government. The Congress of Micronesia is not aware of what is being done with the money. It may be part of the general fund.

Senator Pangelinan: As I understand it there might have been some sort of an arrangement over the claim of this military use of land in the Marianas and I understand that this may be in the trust fund. I don't know about Tinian but for Saipan we have what you call a Saipan Trust Fund and some of the funds are from the military for the use of land by the

military. Some of these funds have been used for the construction of Dr. Torres Hospital, schools and other public facilities. This Trust Fund is presently being held by the High Commissioner.

Councilman

Sylvester Cruz: Being closest to the people, the Tinian Municipal Council as you well understand has adopted Resolution No. 4 expressing the desire of the people of Tinian and I am sure that this is the expressed wishes of the people here on Tinian. I would like to make a request to the Committee to honor this resolution. I would like also to let the Committee know that there has been commissions and committees established without the people of Tinian really being given the chance to freely express their desires. I would like to say that we the people in the Marianas have expressed in the past for a closer relationship with the United States; we would like to continue expressing that desire until we reach our goal. I would like to urge the Committee to give us the chance to negotiate for our future, that future which is commonwealth. We have suffered great hardships during the past years and we would like to find out if possible if we can alleviate these hardships by joining the United States in our future status. Lastly, I would like to say that with respect to the Joint Committee coming to Tinian to let us know the concept of free association, and we now know that there are advantages as well as disadvantages, but we still want them to know that although we are facing the prospect of commonwealth, we also would like for them to continue with their work.

Chairman Salii: I would like to thank Councilman Cruz for his statement.

Francisco Cabrera: I understand personally, and this is my personal opinion, that the Joint Committee is here to find out what are the views and the opinions of the people here regarding our future status, and I understand also that the Joint Committee is in favor of the free association concept and this is the reason why they are here to know and to hear our views on this concept so that they may have something to be guided on in their future negotiations, at the same time they are not trying to convince the people of Tinian, or to try to sell the concept of free association to the people of Tinian.

Leonardo Diaz: I would like to say something to the Joint Committee since it is responsible for the future status of Micronesia. I have a legal question and since we have a legal counsel here, I would like to ask something in this regard. To further this inquiry, as a member of the Council, I would like to ask a question. There has been a homestead program by the Trust Territory Government and according to the Master Plan for the use of Tinian by the military, this homestead program has been suspended and is no longer in operation here on Tinian. I would, therefore, like to pose a question. What are other alternatives in which this homestead program could be implemented? We have been requesting and requesting for homesteads at Marpo Valley and in the old village area, we have been requesting to have the area designated as agricultural homestead but we have been told by Headquarters that there are no longer homestead areas on Tinian. I would like to ask the members of the Joint Committee to help us out in this regard. I would like to say this that although the military has a Master Plan over the use of the land in the old village area that we

would like to say this for the record that we want to take that as homestead first for the people and if the military should want to make use of that land, that it should be acquired from the people. I would like to ask the Committee to help us in whatever they can to expedite the solution of the homestead program on Tinian and to help the people who have applied for homestead here on Tinian.

Mayor Borja: I would like to further the question raised by the Vice-Speaker and that is I would like to have it understood that the District Administrator and the High Commissioner had nothing to do in the dilemma of the homestead programs on Tinian. I would like to frankly state that this was caused by one individual member of the Council and has upset the negotiations of the homestead programs on Tinian. I want everybody to understand that this is not the doing of the Trust Territory Government nor the District Administrator, but it was caused by a certain individual in the Municipal Council that the homestead program here on Tinian has come to what it is today.

Senator Mangefel: I understand that one of the reasons that the Tinian people would like to have a closer and permanent association with the United States is to alleviate the sufferings that have come over the past years. Now, my question will be this: If this thinking can be gotten through other association other than commonwealth, will the people of Tinian think in preserving the unity of Micronesia, going along with the rest of Micronesia, provided that they get the aid under such an association? Perhaps the term "terminable" or "termination" is not legally understood by all of us. When we talk about "termination", it does not mean that it is necessary to terminate now--remember we are making a contract, if you wish, with the United States, and we are trying to get as much as possible for us, and in return the United States is trying to get as much from us in the event we agree to this contract, and if both sides agree to this contract, there really is no reason why it should be terminated. In other words, it can be permanent in some way if both sides signed an agreement. We may get what we want, they may get what they want. Despite of what I have said, maybe some people may not like the idea of "termination", but supposing that in the contract that if you are to terminate that relationship, only if we desire to terminate it, each district's right is protected. In other words, it will have to be 100 per cent, maybe 90 per cent or 80 per cent of the Marianas District, Yap District or Palau District, deciding to terminate, then it will be terminated. In other words, if we write into the compact where each individual district's right is protected not only because some other district decided to terminate, that is if it is changed, then what do the people think of that? Let me now explain, and this is my own personal opinion as to why I agree to the termination clause. It is something like when you put your children in a house and locked the door--I do not want to do this with my children. I want to put them in the house and leave the door open in case the house starts to leak, then they can get out--and if they like to stay in the same house, fine, but I don't want to put them in the house and lock the door--for that reason, you can terminate, or whatever you want to do sometime in the future. I

I am sorry that I sound like a salesman but I do not know of any other way in which I can get some response from the people. If they do not like me, they can just tell me to get out. If people want me to leave, get out, I will.

Chairman Salii: We would like to receive some response; however, if the people are not ready to respond, we would like to take this into consideration and before we make our final decision, we hope that you will take the Senator's question into consideration.

Senator Iehsi: I do not have at this time any questions because I believe that the resolution is self-explanatory. However, I would like to make a statement in response to the question raised by Mr. Fleming on why the Congress took the stand in support of free association. First, I must say that when I took the stand to support the recommendation of the Committee that free association is the best alternative for the people of Micronesia, I was thinking mostly of the people of my district and that is in regards to the provision which deals with citizenship. As stated previously, there was a proposed commonwealth status which was sent to the Congress in 1970 and in that commonwealth proposal it stated that the people of Micronesia can become citizens of the United States which means that you are free to go to the United States, you can have business in the United States, you find jobs in the United States, but that same thing should apply to the Americans who come here--they can own lands, run businesses, have jobs--so, I remember nowadays when there is a job vacancy, it is announced over the radio that Micronesians are given first choice. I know that if Americans are given the same privilege to apply for jobs in Micronesia, at least my people in Ponape cannot compete with the Americans, and that is why I voted for and support the free association status. I personally feel that in order to protect those people who are not educated, the uneducated Ponapeans and at the same time leave the door open for the future generation to decide what they would like to have in the future, we must have the option of termination if we so desire, or have those people in the future terminate the relationship that we have today. I must tell you that personally I can live under a commonwealth status because I am a university graduate, but my father cannot because he is not a university graduate. Thank you very much.

Francisco Cabrera: I would like to get a yes or no answer. Is this Joint Committee negotiating for the entire Trust Territory?

Chairman Salii: Yes.

Ms. King: In response to Senator Mangefel's question that because of the sufferings of the people in the past they would like to have close relationship with the United States and the reason for supporting the commonwealth concept, I know that in the previous Trust Territory the opportunities for the people were limited. I was born during the American administration and I have had the opportunity to have the necessary things in life that were not given by the former administrations and that is why I am supporting the negotiation that is being undertaken by the Marianas Political Status Commission and as expressed by the Tinian Municipal Council and I doubt that the Marianas Status Commission would negotiate something that would be detrimental.

to the people of Tinian.

Senator Amaraich: First of all may I assure the young lady that the Congress will never negotiate something that will be detrimental to the people of Tinian. I would like to ask a few questions. As was stated earlier we are not here to tell you what we want to hear, but we are here to hear what you want to tell us. The Committee has been presented with a resolution from the Municipal Council and we have been asked to give consideration to that resolution, and in order for me to be able to understand and make a decision with respect to the resolution, I think it is necessary that I ask some specific questions. During this discussion, I have gained a few things that I think are with the people here. First, that they want San Jose Village to remain where it is and that they would like the homestead program to go on, and that if the military is permitted here, it should be confined to the present retention areas. The resolution stated that it is the desire of the Tinian people to remain within whatever political status the rest of the Marianas decided upon. I do not quite understand, and pardon my ignorance, what exactly the people want to do and that is why we pose the question: Do you wish to remain with the Marianas or whatever status is formed, even if it means removing San Jose Village, and even if it means stopping the homestead program and even if it means that the military will take not only the retention areas but other areas on the island of Tinian, or even if it means taking half of Tinian and giving it to the military? Maybe I can continue and anybody can answer. When I got here this afternoon I observed my colleague, Senator Mangefel, and some people on the island conversing in Yapese; that made me very happy this afternoon. Also, earlier this evening, I saw Senator Iehsi and another gentleman conversing in Ponapean; that also made me very happy and made me feel at home. Maybe there are some people here who speak Trukese and can speak to me, and maybe some people can speak Palsuan and Marshallese. But, when I came into this building, the first thing I noticed was a newspaper clipping on the bulletin board which read, "First Atomic Bomb Dropped". This is the caption, but it hurts to know that this is where the planes took off to drop the first atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I got scared after reading that, so I have a question, and my question is related to the first question I posed. Are there any restrictions that you have on the use of the land by the military on Tinian? And, in order for me to consider the resolution and other things, I have to know exactly if you are interested in welcoming the military. Do you want to open Tinian up and that there will be no control or restrictions on the use of the land by the military? Or, are there things that you would like the Congress or the Municipal Council to consider? These are questions I would appreciate answers to and get the reaction from the people.

Leonardo Diaz: The first reason that we are supporting the presence of the military on Tinian is for economic reasons. A few months ago there was a release made on the newspaper that the Navy wanted the entire island of Tinian for its use. We became alarmed and due to this, we authorized a Committee of Two to go to Saipan and check the persons responsible to find out why has this been considered without properly taking the matter up with the people. On another occasion, we heard

Councilman
Sylvester Cruz:

military stated that they will need two-thirds of the island of Tinian

Again, I would like to stress the fact that it has been expressed in the resolution that the people of Tinian are supporting the negotiations for close relationship with the United States. I do not think we can answer the question posed by Senator Amaraich on the restrictions to be imposed on the military. I understand that the homestead program has been suspended and I believe this decision came from Washington because of the negotiations for the military here on Tinian, but I understand that this is only temporary. We have read in the papers that the present Village of San Jose would have to be removed for the military and it is being considered to move the people in the San Jose Village to another site. The decision for this move must be first negotiated whether or not the people would like to make the move to another site. I would like to stress that the military may take the present retention area, and if it is necessary that they would need additional lands, that this should be negotiated with the people of Tinian. But, the present decision has not been made with the people and this decision should be in the form of a referendum or plebiscite whether or not the people of Tinian would have to decide for their future, and I believe that this body will be able to make that decision. I would like to say, lastly, that the Marianas Political Status Commission is negotiating for the future use of the land in the Marianas and I am sure that they will not permit any negotiations that will be detrimental to the people of the Marianas. Therefore, as a final request, I would like to urge the support of this Committee in giving the Marianas Political Status Commission the support to negotiate for the future of the Marianas District.

Senator Pangelinan:

I would like to say this again that the Joint Committee has a task to negotiate for the entire Trust Territory; that it has the responsibility to negotiate for the termination of the present Trusteeship Agreement, and that I would like again to ask for your patience and understanding and cooperation with the Committee in its hearings so that they may have something to report to the Congress when they meet. I would like to ask again for your cooperation in giving the Committee your views regarding its visit this evening.

Congressman Balos:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any question but I would like to tell the people here that whatever they decide, I will be willing to give them my support. I believe that nobody else has a right to come and make a decision for you. You are from this place and you have all the right to make the decision in regards to your land or to whatever future status you would like to choose. Whatever decision you want to make for your land--if you want to let the military use it if you want to let somebody else use it, it is your own business to make that decision. As a member of this Joint Committee, I would like to say that if there is anything that we can help you, we would be very glad to assist you. Now, I would like to share some of my experiences with the military because I think the main interest of the United States on Tinian is that they would like to use your lands here for military purposes. I am sure that there is some good about bringing in the military, and as one of your leaders said, it

is good for economic development. I think that if the military comes here, there will be many jobs open to your people here on this island--roads will be improved, docks will be improved--and the military can help the people in many things. But, on the other hand, I think you will be faced with some problems too. In the Marshalls, we have been experiencing a lot of problems in dealing with the military. You probably have heard about these people that have been removed from their islands and put on some islands that are strange to them, it is not like their own island at all. These people could not refuse when the military came and removed them because they said that the military needed their lands and they want to use it and even though the people refused, they really didn't have time to refuse the military. When they asked for compensation, they were compensated but it was not according to the wishes of the people but rather on the military terms. You have probably heard about the bombs that were dropped on Bikini in which some of the people on the other islands were affected with radioactive fallouts. The people on Kwajalein, the landowners on Kwajalein, have leased their lands for 99 years and right now the people cannot go to their own island to do anything on it unless they have identification cards from the military. There are many other problems besides those that I have mentioned, but I just want you to be prepared if the military comes to your island because I know that some of these things will happen if the military comes in. Thank you very much.

Leonardo Diaz: Again, I would like to urge the Committee to help get the request of the Tinian Council to open the old village as an agricultural homestead and if the military considers it necessary to take that place, then it should negotiate with the people and compensate the people for their lands. In addition, we are preparing a committee to go to Saipan to further look into this matter. Lastly, as a parting statement, I would like to ask again for the Committee to help us get that homestead open. I would like to thank the Committee for taking time to come to Tinian to hear our views regarding the expiration of the Trusteeship Agreement and we are grateful that we are given the opportunity to give our viewpoints.

Senator Amaraich: I cannot answer the question on homestead but I would like to say that as a member of the Congress and as a Micronesian, I am very disappointed that the homestead programs have been stopped at this point because of the possibility that the military may need the land. I agree with the gentlemen here that even if the land be eventually used by the military, that the homesteads should not be stopped, that the people should get their deeds and if they are required by the military, the people can give it to the military for its use. I do not want to give out hopes to you people because many of these things are beyond the control of this Committee and the Congress of Micronesia. It would appear from the description on this that this particular decision was made in Washington, D.C.

instead of our District Administrator and our own High Commissioner. I am sorry that this happened without our knowledge. All I can say is that as a member of the Congress, I will inquire into it.

Francisco Cabrera: I would like to say this, that the Congress of Micronesia at the present time is negotiating with the United States over the future status of Micronesia. Therefore, I am sure that the Joint Committee on Future Status as well as the Marianas Status Commission can jointly work towards the betterment of the people of Micronesia and the people of the Marianas for their future status. I would like to again urge the Committee to consider the resolution that was presented officially regarding the future status of the Marianas.

Leonardo Diaz: I am sorry because I thought I had finished my statement, but again I would like to ask the Committee that in addition to what I have said earlier and the reason why I am pushing for the continuation of the homestead program is that there are about 85 applications pending and these are people with no lands and we are urging your assistance in helping us expedite this matter.

Chairman Salii: Thank you very much. Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker--it appears that this Committee has no further questions to raise at this time and no further comments, so we are prepared to close the hearing from our end. We now have taken official notice of Resolution No. 4. It may be that in our consideration of this resolution we might find it necessary to refer further questions to the Council. If that becomes necessary, I hope the Speaker and the members of this Council and the Mayor will again make the time available to us for perhaps a small meeting between the members of the Committee and members of the Council to discuss any detailed questions which may be necessary to raise. If it becomes necessary to raise questions on this, I want the people to understand that it will be in the interest of making sure that we do not misunderstand the real desires of the people of Tinian in our interpretation of this resolution. We are returning to Saipan tomorrow morning and we shall have the opportunity to meet with the Marianas Political Status Commission, with the Saipan Mayor and the members of the Municipal government as well as the Marianas District Legislature next week. I want you to understand that if the direction of the talks continues and that this Committee does negotiate with the United States for the people of the entire Trust Territory and the Marianas Commission continues to negotiate then the people will at least have to choose whatever comes out from this Committee through the Congress of Micronesia and whatever may come out from the Marianas Commission. I do not believe that the existence of the two negotiating teams on the side of Micronesia is necessarily to the disadvantages of anybody in Micronesia because I am sure the Marianas Commission has the best interest of the people of Tinian in mind. I can also assure you that this Committee has the best interest of the people of Tinian in mind. But, because we are all human beings and no matter how close two people may be, they might have differences between them. The saving grace for the people of this island, as well as any people of any island in Micronesia is that neither the Marianas Commission nor the Joint Committee will make the final decision for you. But, because we are elected to represent

the people of these islands, it is our job to help you define what you really want. This is the reason why we are traveling and it is for this reason that we have taken much of your time tonight. On behalf of myself and the members of this Committee and staff, I want to thank the Mayor, the Speaker and the Vice-Speaker and the members of the Municipal Council and to the people of Tinian for making it possible to discuss our future tonight. May I also thank Mr. Maratita for being kind enough to interpret for our meeting.

Speaker Cruz: We want to express our appreciation for this meeting and we hope that you will give our Resolution your full support.

Adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Hearing of the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Congress of Micronesia with the MARIANAS POLITICAL STATUS COMMISSION, in the Senate Chamber, Congress of Micronesia, 9:30 a.m., Monday, July 23, 1973, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Chairman Salii: Good morning Chairman Pangelinan, President Santos, Speaker Camacho and members of the Marianas Political Status Commission. First, I would like to introduce members of the Sub-Committee of the Joint Committee. I am sure you all know each other but for the record, we have Senator John Mangefel, Congressman Ataji Balos, Senator Ambilos Iehsi, Senator Andon Amaraich and myself, Chairman Lazarus Salii and our staff members, Mike White, Sabo Ulechong and Mrs. Evelynna Akimoto.

We want to hear your ideas with regards to our current problems. We are aware of your group; you are aware of the existence of this Committee. We read some of the press releases which came out of your last round of talks between Ambassador Williams and your Commission. Also, some of us were at the United Nations when two of your members, Mr. Joaquin Pangelinan and Mr. Benjamin Manglona appeared before the Trusteeship Council, so we do have some information on the last round of your talks. What we are basically interested in is a common ground for us to work and help each other. Is there anything that we from the Joint Committee's side should be doing, is there anything positive we could do, or is there something we should not be doing? The sentiments of the Congress are a matter of record. I think that the one basic question I am interested in, and this is a good time to bring it up, is this: It has been mentioned that no matter what kind of status is negotiated by the Congress of Micronesia and the United States that the Marianas District still wants to be separated from the rest of the territory. When Mr. Manglona appeared before the Trusteeship Council, the question was raised to the effect that basically what the Joint Committee and the Marianas Commission are trying to work out are the same with the essential difference of the termination requirements in the Congress and the permanent requirements in the Marianas. If that is the only difference between the two groups, and if it were possible to work out an agreement between the districts so that in the event the five districts or any number of the districts choose to exercise their rights to terminate the association with the United States (if there were a guarantee in the Constitution of Micronesia, or the basic agreement of association between Micronesia and the United States contain some very definite guarantee that in the event of the districts exercising their rights to terminate, those districts who want to permanently associate with the United States), under those circumstances, what would be the feeling of this Committee? In other words, is there some basic common ground between the leaders of the Marianas and the members of the Congress to see if based on that common ground they could work together?

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

The other questions are more appropriate for the population, but in this particular case, I don't think they are too irrelevant. We ask what are the other alternatives besides free association that should be receiving more emphasis, independence, commonwealth? We also ask, is the pace to terminate the Trusteeship too fast or too slow? We also ask people whether in their view it is essential to terminate the status quo. What is wrong with the status quo that we want to terminate it? Because the Marshall Islands have created their own status commission and because Palau has created its select committee for separate talks, we at the Congress ask whether we should at this time postpone or terminate the negotiations and let the districts negotiate their future on their own. The case of the Marianas is obvious, but I think because we have this opportunity to get together, we could at least get a confirmation of what these leaders feel. So, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, those are the things I would like to say to open the discussion. If the members of the Committee would like to raise any questions at this time, I will ask them to do so; otherwise, we can proceed with the discussion.

Chairman Pangelinan: On behalf of the Marianas Commission, I would like to welcome you to Saipan and we appreciate this rare privilege to meet with you. I say rare because this is the first time for this Commission and your Committee to meet together. I believe that it will be beneficial for both sides to have this meeting this morning. I would like to introduce members of this Commission. I am sure you all know each other, but for this morning's presentation, we have Mr. Felipe Salas, Dr. Francisco Palacios, President Vicente Santos, Speaker Vicente Camacho, Legislator Daniel Muna, and former Congressman Felix Rabauliman. Some of the members were not able to make it this morning but I can assure you that in the future when we meet again, we will have a full membership. Certainly, you did raise some very serious questions to our Commission, and we may not be able to answer all of the questions that you have addressed to us this morning. For the purpose of this meeting, I would suggest that we have it as informal as we can. I will now ask members to make comments or ask questions at this time.

Chairman Salii: I might add that if anybody wants to go off the record, he could do so and we will turn off the machine and indicate to the Steno.

Chairman Pangelinan: For your information, we have presented to you a statement made before the UNTC by Mr. Pangelinan and Mr. Manglona and a copy of the Highlight, dated June 7, 1973. These represent the official remarks in addition to the joint communique between the Marianas Commission and the United States delegation. In the past, we had been informing the Congress of Micronesia as to the progress of this Commission but our report has not fully been typed out for printing, but I can assure you that upon completion, copies will be made available to you. Other than that, we welcome the opportunity for open discussion and to answer questions raised by the Chairman of the Joint Committee.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Chairman Sali: I would like to ask the members of the Joint Committee if they want to say something at this time. While we are perhaps going over the matter in our minds, let me, for the record, inform the Commission that the next round of talks between the Joint Committee and Ambassador Williams' delegation is scheduled for late September or early October and we are right now thinking of holding that round in Truk at the request of the Ambassador. We postponed the next round from this month to September because, as you may recall, the United States delegation has requested certain options in Palau. The leaders of Palau have informed this Committee that they will not consider making the options available or consider receiving a survey team to survey these areas unless all the public lands in Palau are returned to that district. When that declaration came out, we could not carry ^{out} further work in Palau and because we could not do this, we cannot carry out any discussions with the Ambassador. As a result of our trip to Palau, even though we have not evaluated the hearings there, we have a clear picture which might enable us to proceed further; and one of the other questions we are interested in is--how do the other people in the other districts feel about the return of public lands? Should they be returned to the districts before we terminate the Trusteeship? Who in the district should have control of the lands if and when they are returned?

Chairman Pangelinan: Mr. Chairman, the question you just raised, this Commission did have the opportunity to express itself to the United States delegation. This is a matter of serious concern to the Marianas Commission and during our deliberation at our last negotiation with the U.S. delegation, it was the consensus of the Marianas Commission that we would like to have all public lands, including military retention lands, returned to the appropriate authority or any legal entity created by the District Legislature or to the District Legislature itself. In such a case, that legal entity will hold the public lands in trust for the people in the Marianas. I believe this is an area where we can find a solution to this problem. As you are aware, the United States has certain withholdings in the retention areas not only in the Marianas but in the other districts as well. The United States claims that they did pay some compensation for these lands and they are under the impression that they own these lands until such time when there is a legal agreement between the people and the United States. We feel that military retention land is a matter of serious concern and we would like to have that included in the so-called public land. I am also concerned about the return of this land. I am sure there is mutual interest that the public lands be returned to the respective district or legal entity. Perhaps we can ask members of the Commission to express themselves on this matter.

Dr. Palacios: I feel at this time that the Committee should give its blessing to the Marianas to go ahead and pursue its separate political aspiration as what is being done today. You and I, and many of us in the Marianas in the past have worked and hoped that

030260

Micronesia will continue to unify knowing that the unity of Micronesia at present is the only unit that is being administered by a foreign power. In the past, you and I know that Micronesia herself can never be a political entity as such. We have our government here and there is the different government in the districts. Our relationship was a mutual, friendly relationship even before the colonial powers took hold of this area. I find that it is a fact of life today with the people of the Marianas that there is no unifying factor to feel that Micronesia is one political entity. I blame no one except you and I because we had not created a unifying factor for the people of Micronesia, as a whole, not to mention the Administering Authority's efforts to unify this area. So, keeping in mind that there is this fact, there is no doubt in my mind that we here today have a common interest in education, a common interest in economy, a common interest in social--this is appreciated by all the leaders, but the people do not see any factor that will make them feel that Micronesia is one entity. So, the best way that I see this is for this Committee and the Congress of Micronesia to give its blessing to the Marianas to go ahead with its political aspiration, hoping that in the future, you and I could work something out in such a manner that our relationship would be amicable. At this time, I detect no feeling in general that the people in the Marianas want to keep Micronesia and the Marianas as one political entity after the Trusteeship is terminated regardless of what kind of political structure results. This is a fact of life that I am presenting to you.

President Santos: To go back to the question of land, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why Micronesia today seeks termination of the Trusteeship Agreement is the lack of fairness on the part of the United States Government, specifically on the return of the privately-owned lands held by them after the Japanese administration which have not up to today been returned to the rightful owners. We have what is called public lands, military retention lands, federal lands, and I think it is important that before the question of our status is resolved, that these land questions be solved first. We are talking in terms of millions of dollars to survey lands between private ownership and the government. As to whether or not a public corporation entity be established to handle this so-called public land, I think that these two groups should, and I think we are negotiating this at this juncture, press the United States Government to immediately adjudicate these land questions specifically the privately-owned lands because there are many land owners in Micronesia today who have not yet received their private lands. I think this should be resolved once and for all. Another area involving land, like in the case of the Marianas, the United States contends that they have appropriated some 1.4 million dollars some time in the past for these military retention lands. As you are perhaps aware, these lands are leased for 99 years at \$40 per acre per year. There is also the question of the United States' request to lease or the option to buy the entire island of Tinian including some areas on Saipan like the Charlie Dock area. This is a very great question in our minds because actually we are not negotiating on the basis that we want to give the United

States these portions of lands during this time of the negotiation. I personally believe that we are not negotiating on that basis; that we must give the United States some land in order to achieve the resolution of our status problem. I would like to suggest one important avenue in perhaps solving this land situation between your Joint Committee and our side of the table and that is let us not sell our lands in the event that the United States should want our lands for national security purposes as was the language used by the United States. Our land area as compared to the United States is very small. I do not feel that I could sell our land per acre per year. I think it is important to go by some kind of a political value because once an individual sells his land even if he receives a good price, it would be very difficult for him to re-purchase or get another valuable piece of land. Our lands represent a special attachment to our family. This is a very difficult question and, of course, outside of this table, we need to decide in the very near future, and before the next negotiation, how much land we should release to the United States for national security purposes. I would like to suggest that in the event the Joint Committee decides to give some land, as requested by the United States, for instance a large piece of property in Palau, that you do this on a political value rather than a value per square meter. Our Administration here in the Marianas has also indicated the value of land on Tinian. It has set on record that it has accepted a price of \$35,700 per year. This is a lot of money. An average person on Tinian owns about 4 hectares of property and these are homestead. I would like, Mr. Chairman, at this juncture to say that perhaps the Joint Committee put pressure on the United States Government to immediately adjudicate these land problems. An example that we have here on Saipan is the Beach Road and the road that extends all the way to Dr. Torres Hospital and to San Vicente. Some of these roads belong to the people. The Land Commission can only make title determination and issue certificates but once there is an adverse claim it suggests that the problem be taken to court. I don't know if this is true with the other districts, but here in the Marianas, it is very difficult. We have had one or two cases solved in the 26 years of administration of the Trust Territory Government. When we talk about progress we may say that \$60 million is progress but I do not think that this is progress. I think that progress is when we can return the lands to the rightful owners, that is progress to the family. Before I close, I would like to say this, that your Joint Committee and our Commission work together toward an eventuality of returning all public lands including military retention lands and federal lands before the status question is solved. Once this is done, I think that the new form of government could work smoothly. Thank you.

Daniel Muna:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I agree that we have a common problem and that is the land problem. The District Legislature for almost a decade now has been trying to inform the Administering Authority as well as officials in Washington about our problems in the Marianas which reminds me that in 1969, our District Legislature appropriated some money to send a delegation to the United Nations to present the land problems in the Marianas. The High Commissioner at that time called the delegation going to New York and promised the delegation that the land problem will be resolved before June, 1970. The Administration

came out with a beautiful idea of establishing the land cadastre program. So far, this program has not helped the people of the Marianas, and I am speaking for the people of the Marianas. Then, the Congress of Micronesia came out with the idea of land commissions and we have this land commission but it is not solving the problem. If you have a land problem, the land commission will advise you that if you are not satisfied with its findings, you have to refer your problem to the court, but the court somehow does not want to hear the land problem. To make my remarks short it is my opinion that as soon as the question of political status for the Marianas is solved then all these problems should be resolved right away.

Felipe Salas: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to say that it is a great privilege for us to appear before you and to discuss the matters which we are facing now in regards to the negotiations with the United States concerning our future political status. In regards to the land problems in the Marianas, I would like to ask this: If the United States is not going to solve this land problem right now and we get our new government tomorrow, who is going to carry the burden? Another thing that I am concerned about as a member of this Commission is if the military decides to occupy two-thirds of the island of Tinian and wants to reserve one-third of the land for security purposes, I think that the United States should negotiate with the new government of the Marianas. I do not think that the United States should take the land now. If they should need one-third of the land for security purposes in the future, the United States then should negotiate with the new government of Micronesia or the Marianas government. That is all I want to say to this Committee and I hope that you will bring this matter to the attention of the United States when you negotiate.

Chairman Pangelinan: The Marianas Commission has devoted much time and effort on the question of land and it is our estimate that the land problems that have been created during the Japanese administration are now in the neighborhood of three million dollars in order to solve these various land problems. On the question of timing on the return of public lands and should it be returned to the respective districts or some entity in trust to the people and as Congressman Salas pointed out, who will carry the burden for solving this problem? We have the exchange matter, lack of survey, property description--all these are just a few of our land problems. We have private lands which also fall under the same category. If these lands are returned, who will carry the burden for resolving them? I feel that the United States should carry some kind of monetary assistance if the Marianas Commission should handle the matter. Also, on the military requirements, there will be the question of land appraisal. Do we have the kind of knowledge where we can bring Micronesia's land into a fair market value? Is the military land requirement on Tinian, Saipan, or some other areas in Micronesia really the present need or is this just some future contingency? Do we have the kind of skills that would help us identify the minimal land requirements? What would happen to the surrounding areas where the military wants to fit in? On Tinian, for example, who should negotiate for the military land requirements?

I believe that in this area, the Joint Committee and the Marianas Commission could work together to find the appropriate means to accomplish this. I believe you also raised a question on how we can help each other? I mention land as one area and I think Dr. Palacios is very much concerned of continuing the endeavors of the Joint Committee and as well as the Marianas Commission. I think at this time we will follow that the Congress has the sole authority to negotiate. Would they serve the best interest of Micronesia or the Marianas? There has been some merits and demerits expressed by the local people. I think the statement made before the United Nations very much outlined the reason why we have been negotiating separately. Briefly, to stop the Marianas Commission at this juncture and to continue on the negotiations of the Congress of Micronesia on free association would deny legally and morally the people of the Marianas the alternative on the status for which they have been asking for the past 20 years. The statement clearly spells out in greater details our concern for this separate negotiation. These are some of the concerns that we have and I hope, as Dr. Palacios pointed out, that the Joint Committee as well as the Congress of Micronesia will give their blessings and support to the Marianas Commission in obtaining our political aspiration. I think that we can solve the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement more readily if we have various alternatives presented to the people rather than limiting it. I hope that jointly we have been studying the question of close relationship. I don't think there is any one body that has more knowledge on what the implications are all about. We have spent a considerable amount of money getting the right consultants to identify the legal questions--the application of the Constitution of the United States in which the Marianas or any other district could form a relationship with the United States--and I think that this is a very important matter to present to the people of Micronesia as well as to the people of the Marianas. I think that this body as look at it is the only one qualified at this time to tell the people of Micronesia what are the implications of close relationship. I hope that in the other areas, economic, education and social, you Joint Committee as well as the Marianas Commission could work together and now, I would like to close and have you address yourself to other questions that you may have.

President Santos: On the land question, we have indicated to Ambassador Williams and have told the Trust Territory Government to stop giving out public lands to aliens, an example is the Dillingham Corporation where it asked to lease some lands on Tinian and was approved by the High Commissioner. We did this so that the Commission would have an ample time to decide on all the areas of land problems. Also, not to confuse you, when we talk about public corporation entity to handle our land problems we are not talking in regards to the district land management or the land commission. I believe that the land commission has slowed down many of our land disputes and even land surveys. This is for the information of your Committee.

Daniel Muna: I disagree, Mr. Chairman, with the statement just made. The way I look at it, as to what is going on right now, if it is in the interest of the Administering Authority, then they should consult with this Commission.

Chairman Pangelinan: I think the Joint Committee is aware of the present policy announced by the High Commissioner and that is the stopping of all economic developments and homestead programs on the island of Tinian. This is a very serious matter. In order to formulate the United States interests, a policy had to be set at the expense of the people of Tinian in the areas that are badly needed. This has been told to us by the local people on the last trip we made to Tinian. The case of Dillingham is one example in which it had been approved by the local people, the lease was executed and approved and a few days later was rescinded. The High Commissioner has the authority under the Trust Territory Code to set up such a policy. I would like to see the Joint Committee and the Marianas Commission join efforts to persuade the Administering Authority that this is not in the best interest of our people.

Chairman Sali: You mentioned that it will take three million dollars to adjudicate the land situation. Is that for the Marianas only?

Chairman Pangelinan: Yes, and this is just an estimate by our people, not the land survey team. We are making a second checkup whether the amount will really solve the problem.

Senator Iehsi: I think it is the official position of the United Nations and the United States as well as the Congress of Micronesia that after an agreement is worked out that agreement has to be taken to the people for final approval. In other words we would have a plebiscite. Does your Commission have any position as to whether the people of the Marianas should participate in this plebiscite?

Chairman Pangelinan: The mandate of the Commission clearly spells out this policy that you have mentioned. We have been given a mandate to negotiate for close relationship; subsequently in the future when an agreement is reached it is to be submitted to the District Legislature for approval and eventually to the people. We recognize that the efforts of the Joint Committee once it has been negotiated will also be presented to the people of the Marianas so that both sides of the negotiations will have a final choice made by the people of the Marianas.

Senator Amaraich: In connection with the homestead programs on Tinian, do I understand you correctly that the programs have been stopped without the Commission's official consultation?

Chairman Pangelinan: Yes, the programs have been stopped without knowledge of the Commission.

Senator Amaraich: On this Dillingham situation, was there any explanation why it was rescinded?

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Chairman Pangelinan: No explanation of it nor was there any explanation as to the other business venture that also reached the attention of the High Commissioner, the hotel development between the people of Tinian and the Marianas Development Corporation which was approved by the District Land Advisory Board.

Daniel Muna: It has never come to our attention; this is a public land case.

Chairman Pangelinan: The lease agreement was between a Micronesian and Mr. Jones.

Daniel Muna: The Land Advisory Board has no authority since a public regulation came into existence. The Land Advisory Board will only now handle certain properties in the municipalities.

Chairman Pangelinan: These are two incidents where an economic progress has been shut down.

Dr. Palacios: In the case of Dillingham, I did not receive any official word why it was rescinded but I believe it was due to a certain statement I made which I brought up to the U.S. delegation. The U.S. delegation told us of the great benefits with the presence of the military on Tinian where sand and gravel will be supplied by the military in addition to other materials that the military will bring in. I had pointed out to them that if "they are going to provide sand and gravel and at the same time give an American company the opportunity to make sand and gravel, now where will we Micronesians stand?" I think they saw the picture and I guess that was the reason it was rescinded. I do not know about the economic development part of it but I think it was the right thing to stop Dillingham from operating on Tinian because it was going to benefit Dillingham only and not the people of the Marianas.

Senator Amaraich: Do I understand that the Commission has not made any official recommendation to the Administration on this matter of homestead programs on Tinian?

Chairman Pangelinan: I did, not with the consent of the Commission, but as a senator bring this to the attention of the High Commissioner. On the question of stopping the homestead programs, the Commission has been addressing itself to the U.S. delegation.

Senator Amaraich: Did you get any response?

Chairman Pangelinan: No.

Senator Mangefel: I was not very clear on what you said in regards to the land problem. Do I understand correctly that you said you feel that the United States should solve the land problem?

Chairman Pangelinan: No. I said that somebody should solve this problem because we did not create it. We do not have the resources nor the skills to carry out this program and the question is "who should carry out the burden?"

Chairman Salii: There might be a possibility after consultation amongst the

Committee members that some kind of communication might be in order more or less on an unofficial level with regards to the stopping of homestead programs on Tinian because it may not only affect Tinian but probably the other districts in the Trust Territory as well and I hope we can communicate on this, that some joint communication might be useful. For the record, I would like to say that it makes sense from their point of view that these things came to a halt immediately because assuming that they will get some part of the island of Tinian, as in the case of the homestead, they will have to compensate the people. It only makes sense to stop the program because they will have to compensate the owners for all the things involved in homesteading. We have to take all these into consideration.

Senator Mangefel: I think Dr. Palacios touched on this but I would like to get a clear picture and that is if the district's rights are protected in the Commission's part of the association, what would be your reaction for working together concerning the unity of Micronesia?

Chairman Pangelinan: This is my own personal thinking and that is I think there is a difference of opinion on the question of one district wanting to be closely tied in with the United States --the Joint Committee negotiating for a looser relationship. My concern is how do we reconcile these two differences? Can Micronesia participate and have the kind of interest that some people in the Marianas wish to pursue, that is giving them the privilege of wanting to be a part of the American community? These are some of the questions that our Commission is concerned about. This is my own personal thinking perhaps other members may want to address themselves.

RECESS (10:40-10:45 a.m.)

Chairman Salii: Are there any more comments, statements or questions?

Senator Amaraich: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you have information as to how much land on Tinian and Saipan the United States has indicated it requires for military purposes.

Chairman Pangelinan: Yes, I don't have the record with me, but we do have information on every conceivable requirement of the military.

Chairman Salii: Senator, may we ask that when you have your transcript published, you give the Committee a copy?

Chairman Pangelinan : Yes, it is being printed; however, I have one problem and that is the question of who should first receive the copy. We have been charged to give it to the District Legislature. They will be meeting on the 6th of next month and we will then provide you with a copy.

President Santos: Mr. Chairman, to answer Senator Amaraich's question, presently the United States military is using an island north of Saipan as a target practice area. This island has quite a population of coconut crabs, birds, and a good fishing ground. The United States has requested to lease or buy the area of Micro Beach, and as you are probably aware, is a military retention area. It is

U also requesting all of the Charlie Dock area but will release the Lower Base area and up north of Lower Base.

Chairman Pangelinan: Basically, the United States is requesting for the entire island of Farillon de Medilla for target practice purposes. They are returning 320 acres of public lands for 320 acres of Micro Beach and Charlie Dock area and are requesting to retain 500 acres within Isley Field. They are requesting for all of Tinian but will return one-third of Tinian to the people on a leaseback basis. They are actually requesting two-thirds of Tinian for military purposes. The Marianas Commission has presented itself to this problem and does not agree with all of the land requirements of the United States.

Congressman Balos: This is for my own understanding. I would like to know how were the lands negotiated in the past, the lands mentioned as part of the 99-year lease arrangement. How was settlement made?

Chairman Pangelinan: The Commission is now making study on the military retention lands. We do not know up to the time we have been negotiating how this came about. The High Commissioner has records of all the retention lands. The United States claims that since they have spent money on these lands they have the right to control them. We take the position that public land includes military retention lands and if public lands are returned they are to be returned to the people of this area irrespective of how much.

Dr. Palacios: As to how the retention lands were acquired, the Administering Authority as an administering authority negotiated with the United States and acquired what it acquired. There was no organization or government or entity that negotiated with the United States for the acquisition of lands.

Chairman Pangelinan: Part of the real problem is the matter of exchanged lands where military lands were exchanged with some other lands within the public domain and the people were either probably forced or pressured into exchanging the lands without fair compensation.

Senator Mangefel: Did you say that the military wants all of Tinian but that they will lease back some to the people?

Chairman Pangelinan: They want the whole island of Tinian but they would like to lease back the one-third southern part of Tinian.

Senator Mangefel: What happened to the promise made in Tinian that lands will be given to those Chamorros in Yap?

Chairman Pangelinan: || Senator, it would be the same question as to what happened to the 3,399 treaties that were made to the Indians. We cannot really define it.

Senator Mangefel: But this is in black and white.

Chairman Pangelinan: || There is no black and white with the military. We are at a loss as to what was the promise and we hope that the Commission could remedy the situation.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Chairman Salii: Mr. Chairman, we have no more from this side, and now I would like to have the discussion summarized somewhat. First, that the Commission would like to have public lands including all military retention lands returned to some public entity either created by the District Legislature or to the District Legislature itself in trust for the people of the Marianas and that this should take place before we settle the question of status. Secondly, that the Commission is requesting the Joint Committee and the Congress of Micronesia to give their blessings to the Commission to pursue its separate negotiations. Third, there seems to be a consensus between the Commission and the Joint Committee that where there are areas of mutual concern that joint efforts might be appropriate between the two delegations. Fourth, that we continue as we have done in the past to exchange information as much as possible to maintain close consultation between the Commission and this Joint Committee.

Chairman Pangelinan: Would it be possible to put in a fruit for thought? Whatever we are doing here I believe is in the best interest for the people of the Marianas as well as for the rest of Micronesia. We are making alternatives available to the people. I feel that this is an endeavor that will require little funding and perhaps the Congress of Micronesia through its generosity could make a certain amount of money available to continue this work. I know there are legal problems involved but taking it to the best interests of Micronesia, I hope that perhaps some kind of an appropriation be made to continue this work. Again, I take the position that we are opening an alternative that perhaps some other citizens of Micronesia would like to know what is involved and where the final decision would eventually come from the people. What we are doing now is making available that position. I feel that making the necessary study is a worthwhile endeavor.

Chairman Salii: The record will reflect what has been mentioned. I would like also to clarify in answer to the creation of a committee, it has been made known that it is the position of the Commission that the alternative being negotiated by the Congress of Micronesia will also be put on the ballot for the people of the Marianas in addition to whatever alternative the Commission itself is negotiating for the Marianas. On behalf of all of us here, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank all of you for taking the time to meet with us. I think this has been a very fruitful discussion from our point of view, and I hope that we have been some sort of an assistance to you.

Dr. Palacios: Before we close, I would like to bring this matter that the Commission and the Joint Committee I think should stop addressing themselves and develop a future relationship between the Marianas and other parts of Micronesia which would be viable and fitting to all of us and we should continue our discussions and consultations between this Joint Committee and the Commission.

Speaker Camacho: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee. I appreciate what the Chairman said on the moral support. First,

I would like to say for the record that we are joining the first remark made by Dr. Palacios in requesting the Joint Committee to let the Marianas go forward without any delay or denial by the Congress of Micronesia. The question on how fast or how slow we should terminate the Trusteeship Agreement, it is the opinion of the people of Saipan that we expedite the termination of the trusteeship. If there is any assistance that the Congress of Micronesia or this Joint Committee could give to see the expedition of the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, we would appreciate it.

Chairman Pangelinan: On behalf of the Marianas Commission, we want to thank the Joint Committee for the opportunity of meeting with you and we certainly welcome future dialogue. I am sure that there are many that will benefit from our discussions of the future political status question and I believe that we are the beneficiaries of the status quo. We welcome many future communications or dialogue between the two respective committees. Once again, I hope that your visit to the Marianas is one that is of great interest and benefit to your mission.

Chairman Salii: Thank you very much. We will now call this hearing to a close.

Adjourned 11:05 a.m.

Hearing of the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Congress of Micronesia with the SAIPAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE at the Hafa Adai Hotel Dining Room on Monday, July 23, 1973, 12:30 p.m., Saipan, Mariana Islands.

President Ernie
Milne:

I suggest that we start now, the food service will take for quite some time (luncheon meeting). On behalf of the Saipan Chamber of Commerce, I would like to welcome to Saipan and to this Chamber of Commerce meeting the six members of the Joint Committee on Future Status. I would like to have recognized the Chairman of this important Committee, Senator Lazarus Salii from Palau; the members of the Committee are Senator Andon Amaraich from Truk; Senator Edward Pangelinan from the Marianas; Senator Ambilos Iehsi from Ponape; Senator John Mangefel from Yap, and Congressman Ataji Balos from the Marshalls.

From the Chamber of Commerce, we have Mr. Joe Pangelinan, editor of the I Gasetta; Mr. Neiman Craley; Mr. Mamo Saito, Bank of Hawaii; Mr. James B. Johnson, Sr. Land Commissioner; Mr. David Sablan, Vice-President and General Manager, MICROL Corporation; Mr. Pete A. Tenorio, A&E Division; Mr. Froilan Tenorio, MCC; Mr. Alfred Santos, Saipan Stevedore Company; Mr. Joe Screen, Vice-President of JoeTen Enterprises; Mr. Barry Duggan, Air Micronesia; Mr. Joe Smith, Air Micronesia; Mr. Younis, Marianas Variety; Mrs. Escolastica Cabrera, Escolastica Cabrera Enterprises.

For the information of this Committee, the Chamber of Commerce met last week and decided that the Chamber should not officially voice its opinion to the Status Committee; therefore, individual members presenting their opinions cannot be construed or necessarily be that of the Chamber of Commerce.

Joe Screen: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we only had word of this meeting on Thursday evening that we are to meet with you Monday at 3:00 p.m., and I want to apologize for a very low attendance. We simply did not have time to get all the members present. We had announced over the radio and TV of this meeting, but we simply could not have all the members here. I want to apologize for that.

President Ernie
Milne : I will now ask Chairman Salii to point out the purpose of the Committee's visit.

Chairman Salii: My voice has worn out somewhat so I will stand up and carry on briefly then I will sit down and we will entertain any questions or comments you may have. In a way I regret that the Chamber of Commerce cannot take any official stand on the

question of status at this time, and we understand that this may not be the proper approach. However, there are things that we would like to get some expert advice on that relates to your interest and skills as public leaders in this community. Before we go into those, let me say that we are very happy to be here. We have covered Rota, Tinian; and this morning we met with the Marianas Political Status Commission. Tomorrow, we will meet with the Mayor and members of his Council; also with the Speaker and the Municipal Legislature. We will also be meeting with the District Legislature tomorrow afternoon and tomorrow evening we will meet with the general public. We are inviting anyone who is interested to participate in that public hearing tomorrow evening.

Our purpose in making this trip throughout the Trust Territory is simply to hear what the people think again about the negotiations that have been going on with the United States with regards to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, and what we are trying to establish to replace the Trust Territory Government once that termination takes place. Of particular interest to the Committee is the economic outlook for Micronesia under an association that may be shared politically or full independence, yet has full internal self-government in Micronesia. I think we all can summarize from the negotiations in the past that the Congress puts a lot of stand on the possibility of military presence in Micronesia and the type of compensation that we might derive as a result of making some concessions to the United States military. We would like you to know that, at the moment, we have not had any meaningful alternative presented to us in terms of sustaining the present level of standard in Micronesia, aside from some consideration of direct American support and it looks like if you are going to depend on the United States for some direct financial support, that we have to accept some sort of military presence in Micronesia.

The question we would like to look into before the decision is made is what alternatives are available? What are the means of earning revenue for Micronesia that might make it possible to rely less on the military and perhaps eventually achieving a total self-sufficiency in Micronesia in the area of economic development to sustain whatever political form the people of Micronesia would desire and choose upon. We have not made any independent studies on our own; we intend to get into this, and we hope that anybody who is in the business community can assist and participate in the evaluation on the results of this very important part of the political question. I think we all can realize that if we have the money--without the economic part of the picture--then we will not be discussing the political side of the coin without any difficulty. It is precisely because we do not have the economic wherewithal to support the independent Micronesia that we are looking into some sort of a compromise on the political area

We have a lot of other questions that we pose to the people as we visit them. One relates to land. Should public lands be returned to the districts before the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement? What are the implications of such a move? From your point of view, what would be the result of such a move on the economic part in each district and in Micronesia as a whole? Very closely related to land is what I have mentioned and that is the possibility of accepting military presence in Micronesia. What magnitude, and in accordance

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

with what restrictions which we may want to impose? We are also interested what the people think about the progress we are making. Is the Congress right in moving too fast to try and terminate the status quo? Are there elements in the status quo that might make it a desirable alternative for the next blank number of years, or should we continue the effort to terminate it? We would also like your reaction on Micronesia as an economic unit, not necessarily as a political unit. What are the advantages of Micronesia having a united economic front?

Mr. President, these are some of the things we would be interested in discussing with you this afternoon, and we would like to continue discussing them with you as we move towards the next round of talks in late September or early October in Truk because Ambassador Williams suggested Truk. We will now open the floor for discussion.

President Milne: If any of the members have any questions, please direct your questions to the Chairman.

Chairman Salii: Mr. President, although you stated that you will not be speaking on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce, I would urge the members to address themselves to this issue. I think it is very important that we know the feeling of the leaders in the community, such as the members of the Chamber of Commerce.

Dave Sablan: Mr. Chairman, as you are well aware, Saipan has businesses where the local people as well as people from the outside have joint ventures forming a non-Micronesian corporation. I wonder if the Political Status Commission has given consideration to this. What is the status of these businesses where Americans have invested, is there any date-line given to them? What considerations have you given along this line?

Chairman Salii: Mr. Sablan, the answer to your question is that no decision has been made in that area; therefore, those of us who will try to give you our ideas will necessarily be speaking personally. I will not speak for the Marianas. I think we understand the situation here. In our meetings in Yap and Palau, so far we have not heard any remarks to the effect that there is anxiety to terminate any participation from non-Micronesians in the development of economy here. Speaking from Palau, I think there is a gradual liberation in the attitudes of the people not only to Americans but Japanese investors as well. I say that the future is good in this area. I would say that from the point of view of Micronesia, I think it is necessary to continue this type of cooperative efforts.

Senator Pangelinan: To supplement what the Chairman has stated, I think that there will be a time when internal matters such as the one you raised will be addressed by the Joint Committee and I believe that there may be some negotiations among ourselves with regards to policy and question of investments in Micronesia.

Chairman Salii: Perhaps, we would like to hear your views on the effect of any decision one way or the other. let us say that Micronesia decides that

upon termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, all non-Micronesian investments will be nationalized or treated in that manner, what would the effects be?

Dave Sablan: I have not formed any opinion regarding that, although I am interested from the standpoint of the company I work for, for future planning, whether or not we should continue to bring this in the Marianas; or if the Marianas decides to go commonwealth, and everybody agrees to this--and I know that there have been talks that the Headquarters might be moved elsewhere, and if this is the case, what would be the status of those people who have invested here? What would be the status of those who have invested elsewhere? I have not really formed any opinion nor am I prepared to give any solution to the problem. I understand this morning you had discussions with representatives from the Marianas Political Status Commission and I am wondering whether we could share with you a couple of your discussions.

Chairman Sali: Yes, the meeting this morning with the leaders of the Marianas Status Commission on the political side was not a closed hearing. It was closed in a sense that everybody that was there did not have the opportunity to talk except for the members of the Status Commission, but the transcript of that hearing this morning, as well as the other transcripts of all the other meetings, will be made available, and if you care to look at them, they will be made available.

Joe Screen: In line with Mr. Sablan's question, the community of this District is concerned about what activities might take place with regards to the political body who takes control of the Government of Micronesia subsequent to the termination of the political status, the activities on probably how it would affect businesses. The last session of Congress actually was considering a bill to change the rules on businesses who have invested prior to PL 3C-50, and I have definitely formed an opinion that if Congress should take such action, that those who have invested prior to PL 3C-50 be exempted under PL 3C-50. They have not in effect changed the rule on foreign investments, and if it takes such action on that bill, foreign investment in the Trust Territory, anyone investing today would not know what rules they will be investing under because the Congress may change its mind the following year and make a different rule--I think continuity of thinking on the part of the Congress in terms of foreign investment is very important as far as the public community is concerned.

I have one question and I pose it as a direct question. The Marianas with its present position of separation and going its own way, I think it should be brought on record as to what the position of the Congress is likely to be. Assuming that in the final stage when this final termination is made for the Trust Territory and the Marianas, the Marianas going its separate way, what is the likely position of the Congress of Micronesia with regards to where the Headquarters will be, and the Congress itself, will it be in the Marianas or elsewhere in the Trust Territory?

Chairman Sali: I think the Congress is on record now as saying that regardless of whether there is a change or separation, that the Headquarters will

move to either Truk, Ponape or Palau, and the first step has been taken to look at the possible sites, and the Committee of the Congress has come up recommending Truk and Ponape as the site for the Headquarters; no final decision has been made. I think we can assume with some certainty that as the possibilities of separation on the part of the Marianas get stronger, that the effort to decide on the side of the Congress will intensify. We have reminded Washington and indirectly the High Commissioner that this is one of the decisions that all three assistants must come to grip wityin the near future--the Trust Territory Government, the Department of the Interior and the Congress of Micronesia--because if we delay this decision until shortly before the termination of the status question we can see the chaos that will take place. I do not see the possibility of establishing the new headquarters of the Government of Micronesia unless we decide that we are going to move the present headquarters to where it should be located. This is going to be a big expensive move that will require much assistance.

Joe Screen: Mr. Chairman, should the United States decide that it is possible to administer the Marianas separately while the Trusteeship Agreement is still in effect, what do you think the position of the Congress will be in terms of moving the Headquarters and the Congress of Micronesia? Would it be immediate, late, or just how does it work?

Senator Pangelinan: Mr. Chairman, the Joint Committee on Program and Budget Planning did some feasibility studies on what it would cost the Congress and the future government of Micronesia should the Headquarters be moved to another district. The study was undertaken about a year and a half ago and at that time looked over the cost on the physical needs which ranges from \$45,000,000 to \$50,000,000, this was FY '72 estimates. We've had construction experts who say that construction materials may come up to \$60,000,000 to \$70,000,000, considering inflation. The first question is do we have the resources to move the capitol? Second, are we in a position to move the capitol even if the negotiations are successful? It is a difficult question; it has political, economic and social impact, and I don't think the Congress of Micronesia at this time has addressed itself to the various ramifications entailed to move the capitol. Some people in the Marianas have addressed themselves that regardless of the political climate in the Marianas, we certainly welcome the Congress of Micronesia and the capitol to remain here. This is a political question and the matter should be resolved in the political arena of the Congress of Micronesia. I think our concern is what do you think should be done taking into consideration the hypothetical question raised by Mr. Screen, and what are your concerns should the capitol move elsewhere. I think we are here to get some information so that we can be guided with respect to the political status. At the present time, the Congress of Micronesia has not come up with a decision; the Marianas has not negotiated its desire to the separate status. Foremost in our minds is that it takes money to move the capitol. The political question is who should be the beneficiary of that and we have not come up with any decision.

Senator Iehsi: I can tell Joe that if the Congress decides to move the headquarters to Ponape tomorrow, I will look forward to it.

Chairman Salii: I would like to personally express myself on some of the issues that would need to be resolved in the seemingly simple question of deciding to move the Headquarters to another location. It appears very likely that if the decision is not reached with regards to the status of Micronesia, most likely the other five districts, and settlement is reached with the Marianas people that the United States will press for a separate administration of the Marianas even under the Trusteeship, my present thoughts, and something along this line, is that we can immediately take the first steps to move the Headquarters to the eventual site somewhere in the five districts, and that the cost of moving the Headquarters be borne by the United States since it is going to be for the convenience of the United States that we are moving the Headquarters of the Trust Territory. I think we can say that up to now the decision to move the Headquarters has not really been the decision of the Congress of Micronesia; it is the political possibility of what might happen in the future that forces this question upon the Congress so that we can justifiably say that the cost of moving the Headquarters should be borne by the United States because it is basically for its convenience that this question comes up. I do not also see the delay in moving the Headquarters because once it is determined to have separate status for the Marianas I think it is incumbent upon the Administering Authority to move the Headquarters to a new location. This is personally Salii speaking, and not as Chairman of the Committee.

Joe Screen: The United States at one time actually was administering the Trust Territory out of Honolulu and for many many years administered the Trust Territory out of Guam and for that reason I was wondering what the idea might be if the five districts under the Trusteeship Agreement are administered out of the Marianas. I understand your comment however, Senator. I think the interest is strictly economics. There is no question about the fact that the location of the Headquarters be in the Marianas. As you know we had invited you back for your regular session in January. We certainly welcome you back for your next session and we intend to make your stay in the Marianas as fruitful as possible.

President Milne: It was the consensus of the Chamber of Commerce at its last meeting that we ask you to consider having your session again next year in the Marianas.

Chairman Salii: Senator Ambilos Iehsi, Senator Andon Amaraich and I were at the leadership conference in Truk when a communication came from the Sub-Committee of the Governmental Operations of the Chamber of Commerce. The situation on the next session--the first task force that the leadership sent to the Marshalls to evaluate the facilities there came back with the report that Majuro was not going to be able to hold the January session of the Congress. The leadership decided to give them more time and to come up with a final decision some time this month; that is, the other half of this Committee travelling in the Eastern districts will make the final evaluation of the facilities in Majuro and the location; its recommendation will be final. If Majuro continues to be unable to hold the regular session, it looks like the next session will be held here on Saipan.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Chairman Salii: I would like to personally express myself on some of the issues that would need to be resolved in the seemingly simple question of deciding to move the Headquarters to another location. It appears very likely that if the decision is not reached with regards to the status of Micronesia, most likely the other five districts, and settlement is reached with the Marianas people that the United States will press for a separate administration of the Marianas even under the Trusteeship, my present thoughts, and something along this line, is that we can immediately take the first steps to move the Headquarters to the eventual site somewhere in the five districts, and that the cost of moving the Headquarters be borne by the United States since it is going to be for the convenience of the United States that we are moving the Headquarters of the Trust Territory. I think we can say that up to now the decision to move the Headquarters has not really been the decision of the Congress of Micronesia; it is the political possibility of what might happen in the future that forces this question upon the Congress so that we can justifiably say that the cost of moving the Headquarters should be borne by the United States because it is basically for its convenience that this question comes up. I do not also see the delay in moving the Headquarters because once it is determined to have separate status for the Mariana. I think it is incumbent upon the Administering Authority to move the Headquarters to a new location. This is personally Salii speaking, and not as Chairman of the Committee.

Joe Screen: The United States at one time actually was administering the Trust Territory out of Honolulu and for many many years administered the Trust Territory out of Guam and for that reason I was wondering what the idea might be if the five districts under the Trusteeship Agreement are administered out of the Marianas. I understand your comment however, Senator. I think the interest is strictly economics. There is no question about the fact that the location of the Headquarters is in the Marianas. As you know we had invited you back for your regular session in January. We certainly welcome you back for your next session and we intend to make your stay in the Marianas as fruitful as possible.

President Milne: It was the consensus of the Chamber of Commerce at its last meeting that we ask you to consider having your session again next year in the Marianas.

Chairman Salii: Senator Ambilos Iehsi, Senator Andon Amaraich and I were at the leadership conference in Truk when a communication came from the Sub-Committee of the Governmental Operations of the Chamber of Commerce. The situation on the next session--the first task force that the leadership sent to the Marshalls to evaluate the facilities there came back with the report that Majuro was not going to be able to hold the January session of the Congress. The leadership decided to give them more time and to come up with a final decision some time this month; that is, the other half of this Committee travelling in the Eastern districts will make the final evaluation of the facilities in Majuro and the location; its recommendation will be final. If Majuro continues to be unable to hold the regular session, it looks like the next session will be held here on Saipan.

Froilan Tenorio: I understand that your Committee does not have full approval of the Marianas negotiating separately. Is it possible that the Congress of Micronesia can nullify whatever agreement the Marianas agrees with the United States?

Chairman Salii: It is our position that the Congress of Micronesia is the sole authority to negotiate the status question; however, there are arguments. We have been advised for both sides of the question whether one district can legally negotiate separately. Most of us in the Congress feel that it may be illegal under the Secretarial Order for any district to negotiate separately, but that is not a fundamental position that anybody can identify. There appears to be enough arguments on both sides to make it possible for one district to pursue separately. I think the practical consideration is more important in this respect and it is our position, and we have found out--or, let me say that without the consent of the Administering Authority, almost anything is not possible in spite of the Secretarial Order and other things of that nature, so that we have not made a decision to try to stop the separate Marianas talks. So far we do not see what benefits we might derive for taking the case to court, for instance, or to pursue with vigor the idea to stop them. We have been requested by the Marianas Status Commission for the Congress of Micronesia to give its blessing for its separate talks. We have that request under advisement now. We have not reached anything at this time.

Joe Screen: In line with your reply, Senator, the Marianas Political Status Commission in my own personal belief was formed and acted on as a result of the stated "desire" of the people of the Marianas for what in the mandate is stated a "closer political affiliation with the United States." Most of this stated "desire" was a result of a plebiscite apparently held with a desire to find out whether or not the people of the Marianas want to reintegrate with the people of Guam. During the time the plebiscite was held there was no opposite story told; it was all a one-sided story regarding clearly what you can get if you reintegrate with Guam. My question is, is the Congress of Micronesia going to insist on a political education for the entire Trust Territory including the Marianas to be told what is free association, commonwealth or independence? Is there going to be a political education program toward selling the idea that the people want to hear?

Chairman Salii: I think you are correct in assuming that the Congress of Micronesia will handle this type of program. Yes, it is the position of this Committee and the Congress of Micronesia that before we ask the people to make their choice, an intensive political education program must precede such a choice. Right now, we do not have anything to educate. The idea of free association is still in the process of being defined and the reason why we consult with the people is to assist in the definition of free association. We have reached an understanding when conferring with the people from this district whom we met this morning and there is agreement on both sides that whatever the Congress of Micronesia negotiates with the United States will also be on the ballot for the Marianas people to approve or disapprove in addition to what their own leaders might negotiate separately. Right now we are reviewing the question whether it is possible for the Congress to

present only one alternative to the people or not. We have not made a final decision yet. We are asking the people what they want; whether they want one alternative, but where we have one or more alternative they have got to be thoroughly explained. It is very easy for a question of this nature to be distorted, whether the Congress of Micronesia is trying to sell free association or independence. I think this is where the United Nations must at some point come into the picture and insure the integrity of the plebiscite; and secondly, to insure that the kind of education to present to the people is the real objective type rather than be sold on an idea that they do not fully know.

Dave Sablan: There is a published interpreted booklet. Fortunately it is published in Chamorro, but is there an English translation to it?

Senator Fangelinan: I can't agree more with Mr. Screen on the political education, but I must say that we cannot have political education right now. As Chairman Salii indicated, we have not defined the final draft of what is free association, or commonwealth, for that matter. To have political education now would be to mislead the people. I feel that the question of timing will come about when we have just fully negotiated either free association, commonwealth or independence and then perhaps an impartial committee or residents of the area will be enlightened as to the various ramifications of the negotiations and they will be the ones to go to the districts and discuss openly what has been negotiated. There are a lot of interpretations in the area of field service, but I will be the last to have political education now.

Joe Screen: I was not saying now, but eventually, the people should be told the benefits of free association, the benefits of commonwealth, or independence.

Chairman Salii: I would like to just raise the question regarding my opening remarks. Can we minimize the importance of military in terms of developing the economy of Micronesia?

Neiman Craley: I had a note here in reference to that subject, and I would like to take exception, at least for clarification to some of the remarks that Mr. Screen made on the military on Tinian, and with all due and proper respect of the Daily News, it is not infallible when it reports many events that are taking place where "the military is ready and waiting to step over the horizon and move over to Tinian." As I recall, not too many years ago, a 21,000 foot runway on Majuro was being built for the purpose of building a B-52 base there and somebody had gone back to Japan or Okinawa and reported that there was a 7,000 meter runway under construction when actually it was only something like over 7,000 feet. The military, while it may have designs on Tinian, does not have anything in the actual works at this moment in terms of budget, in terms of programs, and I will just guess that if the military is going to move on to Tinian, it will be some time in the next several years, and it will not be in the magnitude that has been, perhaps, conveyed. So, I will discount this as a major consideration at the moment. I think that there are many considerations that will take primary importance. The second thing

I would like to stress is that while some of the merchants may have individual desires for hosting the second regular session on Saipan, the primary concern of the Administration is that it is not only for the benefit of the Marianas, but the total Trust Territory as well, because by having the session here, it will be a tremendous savings both for the Congress of Micronesia and the Executive Branch. This is just for clarification. In reference to the military, I am not convinced at this moment that the military has the money, and I stress money, to move on to Tinian in the magnitude that has been conveyed in the recent newspaper articles. They are interested, and we know for a fact that they will be soon coming here in the next couple of weeks to check out Tinian. I will say that those same teams came in 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971, and we have constant military teams coming in for the purpose of looking over Tinian and Isley Field.

Dave Sablan: As you know Saipan historically has been primarily a military base. We have seen more of the military on Saipan than any of the districts in the Trust Territory except at Kwajalein. We are used to living with the military. We have gotten along with the military. We have seen what the military did during our regime. For a while, Saipan was a part of the Trust Territory, but it had a unique situation when the Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific was the Deputy High Commissioner. We know what it is to be under the military. It seems that we hear from other people that the military is a "bad thing". I think we can turn that into something good. We know that the United States is interested in obtaining land somewhere in Micronesia to accommodate the military of the United States. We know that they are looking at Tinian. We think that we can negotiate with the United States to solve the military needs and live with the military as part of our community. I believe that there is a part in the community for the military. I do not want the military to monopolize the Trust Territory or anyone district for that matter. For the sake of Micronesia if the people of Tinian, as well as the people of the Marianas, are willing to accommodate the military, maybe we should. And, certainly I trust you, gentlemen, as members of the people to protect the interest of Micronesia and solve the problems with the United States through negotiations. I certainly do not want the military to re-govern the island, to administer this island. I think they could be confined in a camp and select those people who could come here to stay in that camp. I do not like to see this island remain unguarded. If we are to achieve our ultimate independence, I would not like to see any other nation come in and explore our islands without our consent. We have had enough war and if it means preventing war by giving a part of Tinian or any other part in Micronesia, I am all for it.

Pete Tenorio: I will disagree with Mr. Sablan. I think in terms of developing economy in Micronesia, I do not think that inviting the military and encouraging them to develop economically our island is the right attitude. I think there are other ways of developing our islands economically. I disagree with him on the basis from what I understand about the military. Several years ago we thought that Saipan was way ahead from the other districts, but when I look at it and compare it I do not think so. The military really did not contribute to the government of Saipan. If we are to think of developing our

economy by inviting the military, I think that is a wrong approach. I think that there are other ways of doing this and that is by opening up for more foreign investments--relax the "favorite nation clause".

President Milne: I would like to comment on the military, not that I am against it, but I feel that there are other things that could be done, a lot of other sources that could come into Micronesia instead of confining ourselves to the military because we can see in Guam, the military leading in the economic development programs on the island of Guam. I think in general, and this is not only at Headquarters, the economic development programs here in Micronesia is slacking behind time. As an example, we feel that when the military comes in they can build up our ports, but I really do not see it that way. I feel that if we ask Dillingham, or some other companies to form a local corporation --invite a big company to come in and form a corporation locally owned by Micronesians, 49 per cent, or 50 per cent, or what ever, to develop a commercial port, I think this is one way of doing it. There are a lot of other possibilities.

Dave Sablan: I do not know whether I said anything about economy, but I am not saying that we are to rely upon the military as a viable economy. All I am saying is that if the negotiation hinges upon accommodating the military, that we ought to accommodate, but they should be considered secondary as far as developing our economy is concerned in Micronesia. All I am saying is that the roads we have now were contributed by the military. Isley Field was developed by the military. We have a seaplane runway that was not built by the Interior Department. If it were not for the military, we would not have Capitol Hill. I would like to see the military here but not to the extent of monopolizing the area.

Joe Screen: Suppose we didn't have the Marianas Political Status Commission and we only had your Joint Committee on Future Status, and the military comes in and say, "We want to put a fence off Tinian". What do you think your position will be on this?

Senator Pangélinan: I think we are here to learn and, certainly, the Chamber of Commerce and individual members can enlighten us on their thinking of the military proposal. I think that as they are proposing to take the island of Tinian, lease back one-third of the island and wanting control on the major part of the harbor--I think I can tell you that my point of view will be "hell no".

Joe Screen: The Chamber of Commerce is not able to take a position on this, but my view will be that you never let the military take exclusive use of an area.

Mrs. E. Cabrera: I would like to express my support, and that is that I am not too sure that we should change our status in a hurry. We need to see more investments, more money come in to our island from anywhere.

President Milne: I would like to express that the problem in the minds of the business people in the Marianas is that they feel that we are far behind Guam and that the only way to get ahead is to let Micronesia associate with the military as fast as we can. If we can get our own present administration to evaluate the list of the economic problems in Micronesia, I think we can solve the problem. The problem as I see it is that our present administration, and I think also the Congress of Micronesia, should change their attitude in trying to protect our people--which is good, but to what extent, I do not know. I think if they really work things together--for instance, shipping is bad now, but airline service has been tremendously improved--this is a joint investment between Micronesia and the outside. I think that if we can go into ventures of that sort, we may improve our economy more rapidly. To me, the administration has to be told that they've got to change their attitude, and the people in the districts as well. Through combined efforts, bringing people from the outside, I think this will improve our economy. There is too much emphasis on political movement, and too much political emphasis and an empty stomach, I think is not good. I think we should have a basic economy, viable economy, and to start this is to have a joint venture between the administration, the districts, and outside capital.

Joe Screen: On independence, how strong in your meetings in the districts is the feeling of independence? Did you get off in terms of negotiating a parallel situation and get back on the free association track, or are you bound to talk about independence on the United States side?

Chairman Salii: Maybe I should go into some background on this before I come up with an answer to your question. When the Congress first started talking about self-determination, it took upon itself to decide what was good based on its own research and studies and then took that to the United States. I think that as a result of turning down commonwealth as a result of deciding on free association, some reactions set in both within and without the Congress. Now, we found out that as Congress supposedly is representing the views of the people, it is hard for us to go on this basis, and that is why we are travelling around. And, you can be sure that we will be guided on some consensus on any of these issues. We can report that Palau and Yap have an overwhelming support for free association. I have not had much report from the other half of the Committee, but I suspect that much of the same thing will happen both in Truk, Ponape and the Marshalls. The independence movement in the Congress has been gaining strength over the past two years. I do not know whether that will change as a result of these hearings, but independence as an alternative is not a difficulty now between this Committee and the United States. We got this resolved at Barbers Point and subsequent to Barbers Point. This Committee decided that we have to complete the Compact of Free Association before we move into the discussion of independence with the United States delegation simply because we do not see how we can do the two things at the same time. So, independence is no longer the barrier. It has been the land situation in Palau, and possibly other districts that has held up further negotiations.

Dave Sablan: Mr. Chairman, has your delegation the intention that you should accommodate the military for its needs?

Chairman Salii: That reminds me with regards to the question raised by Mr. Screen. The reason that independence came out in Ponape was that what this Committee brought to Ponape did not look too good for the Congress and for the first time Congress saw the possibility that free association as we have negotiated was going to fall short on the minimum requirements of the Congress in terms of defense area, in terms of making land available to the military. They have made that requirement that free association from their standpoint is to require that we give land to them. We have not envisioned this as a quid pro quo on our part, or on their part. I think we can see now that in order for them to consent to free association, we have to make land available; therefore, we are now asking ourselves whether the compensation, the price that we are going to get is worth going into the free association status. That is why the question of land becomes crucial in this whole thing. Now, the next question--if Palau refuses to make the options available, if the military does not get its full requirement elsewhere in the Trust Territory, would the United States still consent to the other part of the free association proposal? There are some of us who may have felt that if the reason the United States is asking for the whole island of Tinian is that they see the possibility of not obtaining their option in Palau and that therefore they have to concentrate on Tinian and forego Palau. The question is would the United States continue to talk about free association with respect to Palau and the other districts, or would after they get their requirements in one district, send the other parts of the Trust Territory to do whatever it wants to do just so long as it does not come to them in a very high price tag?

Dave Sablan: Mr. Chairman, if the military can guarantee us that they would not dominate any other districts, for the sake of the people of Micronesia, if it means giving up three-fourths of Tinian, let us do it to achieve what we want. I have full confidence in the representatives in the Congress of Micronesia to independently negotiate and protect the rights and interests of the people of Micronesia. I know that there has been some talks of the military acquiring certain properties in Babelthaup. Now, would the military be satisfied in not touching Babelthaup if the Congress decides to give a part of Tinian, and not just arbitrarily give Babelthaup, or Tinian, or Ponape, or Truk, or any other district. That is why I asked whether this delegation is willing to give a certain piece of land to the military. I can imagine that if no land is given to the military, we will have a very weak stand and they may go elsewhere to bargain.

Senator Pangelinan: The question whether we are going to accommodate the military requirements in the negotiations--I think the Marianas Political Status Commission and the Joint Committee on Future Status recognize that there will be some defense requirements. The question is how much and what are the mechanics? I think the present proposal of the United States to take three-fourths of Tinian and lease back one-third is not very good. I think that if they could reduce the

030283

requirements perhaps we can accommodate the military, but to bluntly accept that proposal would not be in the best interest of Micronesia

Dave Sablan: All I am saying is that there is the military needs. If that is the problem, solve it. If you don't want the military, say so.

Joe Screen: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the Congress of Micronesia in a bill allows only three months for a constitutional convention. My question, Mr. Chairman, would be why shouldn't it take two to three years on a constitutional convention in an area as Micronesia where you have a very definite lack of education and where it involves people with nine different languages. Why three months, why not three years?

Chairman Sali: We have reasons, all of them based on our evaluation on what we can get through the Congress. You will recall that the three months convention bill did not go through and the reason is the price tag. The price tag for that three months period was anywhere from \$450,000 to \$650,000. It is my contention that once a convention is convened we will have to continue to do the job so that initially it does not matter how long it would take so long as it defines what we are supposed to do. If you have to finance this for three years, you will never get a bit of income through the Congress. It just doesn't have that kind of money. It turned out that three months at \$650,000 was too long and too much for the Congress of Micronesia.

Joe Screen: There are many members of the Congress here and I would like to go on record that I would like to see people to be more realistic in terms of just what it is going to say for the Congress rather than how much it would cost.

Senator Pangelinan: There are five senators here who are already on record, so maybe we should address the question to Congressman Balos.

Congressman Balos: The House's stand on the convention bill is that they feel that it was too soon to do it, and it costs a lot of money.

Senator Iehsi: May I ask Joe Screen a question? Given that the military is going to get what it asks for one way or the other, would it make any difference to you as a businessman whether the Marianas have a close or permanent relationship with the United States, or a loose association?

Joe Screen: You are talking now to a person who has selected to remain here for the rest of his life. I don't think the United States should have any problem under free association. Your problem is that you want a unilateral termination. Were I a citizen (of Micronesia?), I want to keep my options open, and withdraw the minute the rest of the Trust Territory free association unilaterally decides that they want to terminate. I want to keep my options open. As a Micronesian, I think I would like to see free association because you don't know how your children are going to feel 20 years from now. I would rather keep my options open. I would rather have my children's options open.

030284

Mrs. A. Craddock: On this matter of making a choice of affiliation with whoever it is, the United States or Japan, if you're in the process of really affiliating, I doubt very much that you will be able to affiliate and keep your options open because if you are setting up basis for certain institutions, they will reach a pretty permanent situation. In other words, even in the past when we had the Trust Territory, we had the Trust Territory Code which was patterned under the United States law and by having the Code you're kind of making a choice of affiliation. I think it is impossible to keep your options open.

Joe Screen: Keep the options open in the Marianas.

Senator Iehsi: I would like to hear a reaction from Dave to my question. Given that the military gets what it asked for in the Trust Territory, would it make any difference whether you are associated with the United States under commonwealth or free association?

Dave Sablan: Quite frankly, I have kept my nose out of politics unlike Joe Screen. I think that if economically it brings more moeny in that way, then I will take that. I think there are businessmen, politicians and common laborers which make up the community and I cannot be an expert on everything. When it comes to business, you may come to me, but when it comes to politics, I will look to you congressmen.

Pete Tenorio: Mr. Chairman, what is the timetable for the resolution of the Trusteeship Agreement? Is there a set time?

Chairman Salii: No timetable has been set up. We would like to think that every round should be the last round. In terms of isolating the issues that have to be involved, we have done that in the past three years. We know the issues now. The bargaining part is set in and there is simply the question now of setting a dateline on it. The United States seems to think that it is the job of this Committee and the Congress to maintain the unity of the other five districts even while saying that we should not really interfere with the Marianas separate talks. We are in agreement to this. On the other hand, it is our responsibility to keep the five districts together. We think this is unfair because it should be one way or the other. Some of us have told the United States that if there is some interest on the part of the United States to see that the other five districts remain together, then it is incumbent upon this Committee to come to some conclusion. It is not possible to maintain the unity of the Trust Territory singlehandedly on the part of the Congress of Micronesia. There has to be a joint effort between the Administering Authority and the Congress of Micronesia

Pete Tenorior: Can the Trusteeship Agreement be terminated on the basis of the early solution of the status talks between the Marianas and the United States?

Chairman Salii: It seems the consensus of the United Nations and the consensus of the United States that termination should take place at the same

time for all parts of the Trust Territory even though solution might be different. In other words, if an agreement is reached with the Marianas before any agreement comes up with respect to the other five districts, the Trusteeship Agreement cannot be terminated with respect to the Marianas alone.

I would urge the members of the Chamber of Commerce to review, if they have not already done so, the provisions of trade and commerce in the Compact, and if you have any suggestions on how they should be changed from the point of view of the businessmen in Micronesia, we would appreciate hearing them. I would also urge you to look into the other titles in the Compact on immigration and travel and on the finance provisions, and if possible, let us know your views. Your views will help us to a great extent.

Senator Amaraich: I would like to join the Chairman in requesting that as members of the Chamber of Commerce you review the provisions in the Compact before it is too late as they involve shipping, airlines, and so forth, which I do not know much about and I need your help in telling me what you want.

Chairman Salii: On behalf of the Committee, we thank you very much for having appeared before this Committee.

Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Hearing before the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee Future Status, Congress of Micronesia with the SAIPAN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, on Tuesday, July 24, 1973, at 9:15 a.m., Saipan Municipal Council Building, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Interpreter, Legislator Daniel Muna

Chairman Salii: Mr. Speaker and honorable members of the Saipan Municipal Council, on behalf of this Sub-Committee, let me say good morning to you. Before we proceed, let me introduce members of the Committee and staff. At the extreme right we have Senator Andon Amaraich from Truk; Michael White, staff attorney; I am Lazarus Salii, Chairman; Mrs. Evelynna Akimoto, our stenographer; Congressman Ataji Balos from the Marshalls; Senator John Mangefel from Yap; Senator Ambilos Iehsi from Ponape, and Sabo Ulechong, Clerk of the Senate. Before we go on, I would like on behalf of this Sub-Committee and the full committee of the Joint Committee on Future Status to express our appreciation to the Speaker, the Mayor and members of this Council for giving us this opportunity to meet with you.

Today is the last day of our hearings. We have covered the districts of Yap and Palau and we have gone to Rota and Tinian. Yesterday, we met with the Marianas Status Commission and with the Chamber of Commerce. After the meeting with the Council this morning, we will meet with the Marianas District Legislature, and in the evening at 7:30 with the general public and whoever is interested in meeting with this Sub-Committee.

I do not think there is any great need for me to go into much background. We all know that the Congress has been looking into the question of future status for Micronesia for the past five years. We also know that this District has in the recent past created its own status commission and has had its last round with Ambassador Williams not too long ago. Our job during these hearing is to get as much information from the people of Micronesia as to what they desire with regards to their future. This has become necessary in the opinion of the Committee because not only the Marianas has created its own status commission but the people of the Marshalls also have created their own status commission and the people of Palau are now studying the desirability of separate talks with the United States. Therefore, it is essential that we consult once again with the people so that during the next round of talks with the United States we could be in a better position to inform them what the general feeling in Micronesia is, and if possible, what the general feeling in each district is.

One of the questions we have been raising at the hearings is whether it is the desire of the people to have the Congress' negotiations terminate or come to a halt and let the districts undertake direct negotiations with the United States. The Congress in the past has given emphasis to the idea of free association in each of its negotiations.

Another question we would like to know is whether there is desire in Micronesia to have more than one alternative explored besides free association and if so, whether they be independence or commonwealth, or whether there should be additional alternatives which should receive some investigations.

In the negotiations for free association, the Joint Committee and Ambassador Williams have come up with an incomplete draft compact of free association. We would also like to know what the reaction of the people in Micronesia is to the provisions that are already in this draft compact of free association. What we are especially interested in would be the reaction of the people to the provisions with respect to land in Micronesia that it be made available by Micronesia for the use of the military. We also would like to know the reaction of the people to the provisions already in the compact wherein the powers and authority over foreign affairs are given to the government of the United States and with respect to provisions on defense where full power is also given to the government of the United States. Another very important question is are the people behind the Congress in its efforts to terminate the status quo. Is it all that necessary to move with so much speed to terminate the present form of government and replace it with something else? And, last but not the least, we would like to know the reaction of the municipality of Saipan with respect to public lands. People in the other districts have maintained that the public lands be returned to them before we terminate the Trusteeship Agreement. We would like to know the reaction of the Council members of this Municipality with respect to return of public lands. What should we do with it? Should we return it to the people? Who in the district should receive it if it is returned? I have listed these basic questions that we would like to discuss with you. I think now is the appropriate time for us to pause and we would like to receive any documents or oral presentation that anyone would like to present to the Committee at this time, and if it is agreeable with everybody, we will open the floor for discussion on these questions or any other question that may be pertinent to this whole issue.

Speaker Camacho: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee. On behalf of the Municipal Legislature and district commissioners, I would like to welcome you to Saipan and also thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and exchange ideas and perhaps we the people in the Marianas would have some ideas to pick up from you which would be very valuable to us. I think it is a good idea to have a close communication between the Marianas people and the members of the Joint Committee on Future Status of the Congress of Micronesia. I would now like to ask members of the Saipan Legislature and district commissioners to express themselves at this time.

Please excuse me and before we proceed, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce members present today.

We have with us Congressman Jose Q. Lizama; Congressman Joaquin S. Torres; Congressman Jose Q. Guerrero; Congressman John Diaz; Congressman Pete Guerrero; Congressman Pangelinan; Commissioner Leonardo Guerrero; Commissioner Albert Camacho; Commissioner Benavente; Commissioner Cabrera; Commissioner Cepeda; Commissioner Guerrero and Commissioner Taisacan. Our interpreter this morning is Mr. Daniel Muna.

Albert Camacho: Thank you very much for your presence this morning and for the opportunity to find out the desires of the people of the Marianas. As a member of the Municipal Legislature, I would like to express my opinion, and I believe it also the opinion of the people, that we want the Status Commission to help us in finding our political status. This is the desire of the people as I gathered it. The Marianas is asking for a close relationship with the United States that of commonwealth status and I hope that your Committee will understand that this is the desire of the people and that it should be respected.

Chairman Salii: Thank you very much, Mr. Camacho.

Joaquin Torres: You mentioned earlier that the Congress has given emphasis on free association and you raised the question as to whether there should be more alternatives presented to the people. I think the question is evident that there should be more. The people in the Marianas District seem to be in favor of commonwealth as proposed by the U.S. delegation; the Congress of Micronesia has gone on record, if I am not mistaken, that that form of status is totally unacceptable. I do think that the Committee would need to do a lot of selling to the Congress of Micronesia in order that the Congress might endorse this proposal. If alternatives are provided on the ballot for the people of Micronesia when the day comes for this plebiscite, and in the event that for instance free association is voted by the people of Micronesia as majority, and for instance the people of the Marianas voted for commonwealth, which would be the political status? Let us say that Ponape, Truk and Yap voted for free association, the Marshalls voted for independence, and the Marianas voted for commonwealth, would the Marshalls be given the right to assume the status of independence and the Marianas assume the status of commonwealth, or would free association be the status for the Marianas and the Marshalls?

Chairman Salii: It is a very good question, Mr. Torres. We have not made any decision on this. The question is who has the authority to make this kind of decision. At the moment, I do not believe it is the Committee that makes this decision. I am doubtful that any one group can make the decision. I tend to believe that the United Nations and the United States would have to come into the picture. We have raised the question as to who is the proper authority to make this kind of decision. Counsel, do you have anything to add?

Mr. White: It is a decision that has to be made some time in the future.

Joaquin Torres: You also raised a question relative to land requirements of the

military in Micronesia. Also a question on our reaction with respect to public lands. Who to return it to? On the land requirements of the military, it is my position that the military should be given only those lands which it really needs. I feel that the military should not be given lands for contingency use. The land to be given to the military should be only that portion that is to be used and no future land requirements would have to be negotiated with the people of Micronesia. I feel that the Marianas Status Commission is giving too much in the land requirements and I would press the Joint Committee on Future Status to help us out in this regard. I am in support of the Joint Committee in its efforts to give the military what it only needs and that is all, no more; and I would hope that the Joint Committee would continue to negotiate for even the Marianas District in the military land requirements. The issue on who to return it? I disagree with the Marianas Status Commission with its recommendation that it be given to the District Legislature to create a public corporation for these public lands to be entrusted to. I feel that each municipality should be given that right to decide what it should with the public lands that are now in trust. I am in support of the establishment of a public corporation but I want this public corporation to be established by each respective municipality and not by the district legislature. I feel that we are in a position to know what is on our island and the same goes to Rota and Tinian. As you probably know, the majority of the members of the District Legislature is from Saipan, and perhaps, it is not fair to have the District Legislature have the final say with regards to the lands in the municipalities in the Marianas District. I will just stop here for now and give the rest a chance to talk but I would like to come back again to give you my reaction on the provisions of the compact in regards to defense.

Chairman Salii: I am sorry Congressman Muna that we did not have a chance to translate. Would anybody want Mr. Torres to summarize what he has just said? I am reminded that most of the people here speak English, but if they want to speak in Chamorro, fine; otherwise English would be faster.

Commissioner Benavente: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate your coming to Saipan and we welcome you. It has been a long time since we want to find the right way for our people and we have gone so far in our endeavors to be closely associated with the United States. I am asking this honorable body to give us the opportunity and the right to make our decision. We are getting tired now and as I understand it we are just about to reach that goal. Your coming here is very helpful because we want to solve this problem. As you know we have disclosed our choice of status and that is commonwealth. I am not sure about the desires of the other districts but this is what the people of the Marianas want and I am hoping that you will help us in this regard. I am requesting that whatever the people in this district decide it should be respected and whatever the other districts decide should also be respected by the people of the Marianas.

030290

Speaker Camacho: At this time now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out some of the questions raised in regards to the return of public lands before the end of the Trusteeship Agreement. We would like to have all public lands returned before the end of the Trusteeship Agreement. The question as to who the land should be returned to is a good question but I am not afraid of that because eventually there will be a new government here in the Marianas if the status talks go off successfully. I would like to urge the Committee to conduct a study to find out how much it would cost to have these lands returned to the Marianas before the end of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Jose Guerrero: First of all, I would like to ask the Committee what do they intend to do with the result of these hearings. I guess the Committee is fully aware of our position, our future decision, which is commonwealth. Not too long ago, as I understand it, one of your members had protested before the United Nations of our intent. We feel that the Congress is not in favor of our move and it is for this reason that I ask you what do you intend to do with the results of your hearings.

Chairman Salii: That is a very good question. First of all let me say that the meetings, our hearings, are fully recorded and we will publish the hearings in their entirety, in verbatim form, and this will be published, I would say, in about 4 weeks after the hearings come to a close so that whatever is said by everyone who had a chance to speak will be made a matter of public record. In that way, anybody can go to the transcript and be able to get a fairly good idea of the people in each community and what the people in each district said to the Committee. In other words, if the consensus in one district becomes obvious and the Committee decides not to follow that consensus; then the Committee would have to justify its action as against the records of the hearings. We have not discussed what we will do in this case. Obviously, if the hearings continue to turn out as they have in the past in the Marianas, the Committee will have to make a decision. The least we have to do, I believe, would be to point out every situation to the Congress of Micronesia and ask the Congress to give due consideration to every consensus expressed. I cannot tell at this point what the Committee's recommendation would be with respect to the Marianas situation because the hearings have not been concluded, but I can tell, without consulting the members of this Committee, that we are not against any sentiments, any opinions expressed throughout these hearings insofar as there is consensus between the municipal legislatures and the Commission and the District Legislature and the general public as to what the people of this district desire. I think it is common knowledge of the expression of the people of the Marianas which has been expressed in the past up to now but we feel that we cannot assume things, that we have to go once again to the people and ask them so that if we make a report to the Congress or to the Ambassador, we can give him a good picture of what we ran into. We had postponed the next round of talks with

Ambassador Williams simply for this reason. We wanted to go to the entire territory again and hear what the people have to say so that we can be guided by what the people tell us at these hearings.

Jose Guerrero: I would like to ask the Committee's consideration to support the intention of our delegation in our separate status talks.

Joaquin Torres: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to give my feelings on the question you raised with regards to foreign affairs and defense. Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee, I believe that the American policy has taught us at length that we should not entertain the idea of giving the United States full control over foreign affairs. It is my understanding that they should be consulted and have to agree in all matters related to foreign affairs. In defense, I feel that Micronesia should not allow the installations of nuclear weapons, dangerous gases or chemicals. With regards to the question whether or not the people are behind the Congress' efforts to terminate the status quo, it has been observed that the people are not in favor of terminating the status quo but I feel that the people with the Congress' efforts can terminate the status quo. I feel, as mentioned earlier, that the people of the Marianas have long waited for a change in status and we would appreciate very much your efforts in our desire to terminate this status quo to a new status--it may be free association, commonwealth, independence or other. I would like to comment briefly on another matter and this relates to the present situation where the Marshalls has established its own status commission and Palau is now considering a separate negotiation with the United States. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee, the Congress should have seen fit from the beginning to involve the respective districts in this negotiation. I feel that this Joint Committee should be composed of members of the Congress, one member of each district legislature, one member of each municipal council and perhaps one from the magistrates. The Congress seems to be in a bind where we have one district wanting to go one way. I would like to raise a question here. Does the Committee have any plans in trying to get these people together again? In other words, we have the Marianas Status Commission conducting its own separate talks. In a not too distant future, perhaps Marshalls will conduct its own separate talks, and Palau will follow later on. Do you feel that this is really good for Micronesia, or do you feel that the districts that have planned to go their own way could come back together again?

Senator Mangefel: I am not speaking as a member of this Committee nor am I speaking as a member of the Congress of Micronesia, but I am speaking as a citizen of Micronesia. Yes, I think it is a bad thing to have the districts separated. I don't think that we can afford to do that but my predicament is that I find that each district may have different aspirations from the other districts but I am still hopeful that somehow this could be arranged whereby each district could go its own way and yet still remain under one unit. I feel that

because of our location we need to be together and put up a strong front. The Committee has not discussed this so I cannot speak for the Committee nor for the Congress, but as a citizen of Micronesia, this is the way I feel.

Chairman Salii: I think you've put your finger on the dilemma that the Congress is now faced with. I think part of the problem is that the negotiation to resolve this whole question has taken too many years, and I think that there are differences between the districts but I believe that if we were successful in getting a solution, let us say two years ago, we may have been able to maintain the unity of the territory. I believe part of the problem is internal. It has been expressed by a lot of people from my district, for instance, that whatever the future government of Micronesia is, it would have to have a lot of power, and that is why they are reluctant to go into this kind of arrangement, and therefore I personally do not think that we can form whatever government that we will have in the future until we can carry a consensus of the people whether we want to remain together or not. The land question is crucial. From what I hear of the Marshalls, if they do not have much say in the revenue sharing, they will withdraw from the rest of the territory--and that relates to land because land brings a lot of revenue to Micronesia and to the Marshalls. The people of Palau feel that unless they have control of their lands they are reluctant to go with the rest of the districts to form a Micronesian government. I personally feel that it is good to maintain the unity of these districts, but unless we thrust out all the problems and form a government which we are sure of, then the chances of falling apart perhaps will be overwhelming. It is good to ask ourselves whether we can maintain unity or not; if not, we must recognize this factor and take it from there.

Joaquin Torres: Should it be the consensus of the majority of the districts to be together, would the Congress support such a move? If so, what do they plan to do to keep the districts together?

Chairman Salii: One thought is, what you suggested, and that is perhaps the district through the district legislature and other governmental levels, including the executive branch and the district administration should participate in the full negotiations. Another suggestion is to have a commission on national unity and perhaps take suggested ways in which the negotiations would be to try and maintain the unity of the area. There has been no decision yet as to concrete steps that might be taken except to move with some speed at the next round to see if we can come out with the rest of this Compact so that the people could have a chance to review it. One of the questions raised with the Marianas Status Commission yesterday, and I think this is in the route of this question of unity, is whether if the Constitution of Micronesia provides that in the event that free association is terminated, which district would have the right to continue as a separate association with the United States. Would this be satisfactory with the Commission?

The response we got is there is very little if any feeling of association in the Marianas with the rest of Micronesia and that therefore it is the desire of the Commission to ask this Committee and the Congress to give their blessings to the Commission to continue its separate negotiation. It has been the feeling of this Committee, and let me put it in the form of a question: if the Congress of Micronesia changes its position from free association to commonwealth along the same line that the Marianas Commission is trying to obtain in its negotiations with the United States, would the Marianas be willing to remain with the other five districts? I think we have to be guided by this because we have to advise the Congress whether there are circumstances in which the Marianas is willing to remain in the unity of Micronesia, or whether under no circumstances would it remain with the rest of Micronesia.

Joaquin Torres: I feel it is incumbent upon the Joint Committee and the Congress of Micronesia to educate the people on this matter. I feel that there is so much ignorance on the part of the people. There should be some accommodations if we are to maintain unity. The Marshalls and perhaps the Marianas have initiated their own separate talks because of the fact that the Committee or perhaps the Congress of Micronesia had not been willing to accommodate the two districts and I feel that every effort should be given to settle this matter, that the Congress should try to accommodate the different desires of the people of Micronesia. We look at the Congress as the uniting factor for Micronesia and if the Congress is not willing to do this, we might as well forget it. I feel that there should be more dialogue. I would urge the Committee to give more dialogue in the districts. I do not have any suggestion on how to initiate this but I feel that this is a must and that it should start now before it is too late.

José Lizama: I would like to ask of this Committee to let us decide what we in the Marianas desire at present. In my opinion, from 1521 to 1944 the six districts were separated from east to west and the western Marianas, and the way I look at it now, for instance if you mix type B positive blood and type O negative blood in a person, that person could die; therefore, I would like to ask this Committee to pray for us and to pray for us for our future.

John Diaz: You raised a question that should the rest of the districts go along with the commonwealth status, would the Marianas remain with the other districts. It is my personal feeling, and I have discussed this with other people, that even if we have commonwealth as our political status, the people of the Marianas would still want to be separated, that the Marianas would like to get out of Micronesia. I feel that each district should be given the opportunity to make its own status decision because I feel that some of these districts are in the minority and if we ever negotiate, if the Congress of Micronesia negotiates for a political status, that some districts would be hurt because of the fact that they are in the minority; and I do not think that we can accommodate everybody; so I feel that each district should make up its own mind on what

it wants. I would like to see Micronesia united but I might say that it is next to impossible.

Leonardo Guerrero: I would like to thank you for your presence this morning. We appreciate this because this is the first time that this Joint Committee has ever met with the district commissioners and the leaders of each municipality. We would like to know whether the other five districts have a different feeling in regards to the people of the Marianas where we are trying to obtain a different status.

Chairman Salii: I can report for Yap and Palau. I believe the consensus in Yap is that if possible they would like to see the districts stay together. They expressed this hope. The people of Palau also expressed the hope that the unity of the Trust Territory be maintained.

Leonardo Guerrero: It has been a long time since the Marianas tried to obtain a different status and I cannot understand the reason why we should be criticized now that we are in the process of obtaining the desires of the people. The other five districts have their congressmen and senators in the Congress of Micronesia and if the people in the other districts desire a different status, then they should obtain their different aspirations. I am asking the extent of the interest in which we should be bound together.

Chairman Salii: I did not say that the people of Yap and Palau are criticizing the desires of this district to be separate. I think that they are expressing hope that if it is possible to maintain the unity of the territory, that they would like to see this. I don't think that they are criticizing anybody.

Leonardo Guerrero: There have been some sentiments expressed in regards to the desires of the people of the Marianas. Why were such sentiments expressed?

Chairman Salii: Yes, Congressman Guerrero also raised that question which I failed to touch upon. This Committee has no power. It will be illegal for this Committee at this time under the law we operate on to support the separation of one district for disuniting.

Leonardo Guerrero: We thought that you are aware of this problem because you have been exposed to this problem for a long time.

Chairman Salii: Yes, in the event that this Committee finds that we have to continue separate negotiations, the Congress of Micronesia will have to amend its resolutions, its laws and perhaps the Secretarial Order would have to be amended before we can legally discuss separate negotiations, but I think the legal problems are not that crucial, I think the important thing for this Committee to do is to listen with open ears and be able to recognize what is being told to it by the people and be able to reflect this in its report to the Congress. Even within the full committee, we cannot ignore the sentiments of one district because each district has a representative in this Committee, and because this group we have here

comprises only six members of the Congress of Micronesia; unless we wait for the full committee, all twelve of us, no single one of us here today can give you a definite answer on whether we can recommend that the separate Marianas negotiations be sanctioned. We simply do not have that authority. But, as I have said, and I want to emphasize again, that every opinion expressed will be made known to the Congress at its next session. I think there is also the question whether the people of one district accept the Congress as a spokesman or not but that is a political problem we have to accept. In the meantime, the Congress is obligated to listen to all of the districts and the least that we should be doing, and I am speaking for the Committee, is to maintain an interest in the welfare of the people of the Marianas; and therefore, it is incumbent upon this Committee to review whatever the United States is proposing; and before you make your decision, it is our obligation, because we are still in the Congress, all six districts, to have our feelings known to the United States proposal whether it is good or bad. The final choice is yours but in the meantime while we review it, the Congress is entitled to come up with its own evaluation. The final decision belongs to the people here; the Congress is not going to make the final decision. I think the Joint Committee and the Congress have made a decision that it is our job to review but the final decision belongs to the people.

Leonardo Guerrero: Lastly, I would like the Committee to consider the length of time that it has taken the people of the Marianas to have this separate negotiation. That is all.

Pete Guerrero: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I would like to talk on the feelings shared by everyone. The way I see it almost everyone in the Congress favors the unity of Micronesia. I would only wish that this feeling is also shared by many individuals in Micronesia as well as on Saipan. Senator John Mangefel mentioned that the feeling in Yap is that the people would like to see that Micronesia is united. I pose a question here. As we see it there are two issues within the Congress of Micronesia, the issue of independence and the issue of free association which is stressed the most. I recall that during your negotiations with the United States in Hawaii you presented the outcome to the Congress, the Congress turned it down seeking for an alternative of independence. In Truk we have heard of a group called the Independence Coalition. This presents differences of opinion insofar as the wishes of the people are concerned. Let me remind you, Mr. Chairman; and members of the Committee, that the Marianas District had expressed its desire since way back in 1965 and even before. We expressed our desire to the United Nations and to the United States to become at that time a part of Guam. The result of a referendum showed about 85 per cent of the people wanting to go into a closer association with the United States. I am not saying that we do not want any part of Micronesia but, Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee, under the circumstances, if the Congress of Micronesia does not recognize the intention of the Marianas, it will hinder the future generation and our future developments. I don't want to see this happen. I seek your support and understanding. I would say that maybe in the future after

the Marianas District has been given the authority to seek its own separate negotiations with the United States maybe then the Marianas could also invite other districts who are interested in the steps that the Marianas is taking. It is so obvious that the people in the Marshalls are seeking separate negotiations, the same with the people in Palau. The people in Truk have also made their feelings known. If all the districts are together and are behind the same interest, I can see a unity in Micronesia, but with the differences of opinions and feelings, I would say that it will take a long time just as it has happened in the Marianas. At one time there were two different feelings in the Marianas, one opposing the other. At this time, as you know the members of the Marianas Political Status Commission are representatives of different political parties on the island and business leaders, who were representing at one time different feelings, but are now together in their efforts to seek the benefit of the Marianas people and it would be very sad if the Congress of Micronesia tries to change the intention of the Marianas people. Lastly, I would like to ask your kind consideration and support to allow freely the Marianas Political Status Commission to continue on its negotiations with the United States of America. Thank you.

Senator Amaraich: I have one or two questions for clarifications. Mr. Torres proposed that if we give a land to the military we should give only what it needs immediately and can use. My question is, let us say that the military immediately needs Rota and can use Rota immediately, would the people be agreeable to give Rota away?

Joaquin Torres: I feel that there should be every protection and the best interest of the people should be considered first before any land is given to the military.

Senator Amaraich: This may be difficult to answer but you also raised the question as to whether it has been decided in the case of a plebiscite, whether the majority should rule, the majority of Micronesia or the majority of the district should rule in the decision. To narrow it down, I will use the Marianas as an example, what kind of recommendations would you propose in the case of the Marianas where we have a majority ruling, what would happen to the other group of people who may not be in agreement with the commonwealth status? Should we let them make their own decision or should they be dominated by the majority?

Joaquin Torres: It is a difficult question and I cannot give you an answer. I feel that we should study it and I feel that there should be some recommendations. It is a difficult question, but this raises again another question where we have people here who want to be with the other districts and if the majority comes out favoring closer association with the United States, are we to ignore the minority in the Marianas? I guess this is the same type of question.

Senator Amaraich: What I am interested in is whether the people present here have any recommendations because this is something that we have to face in the future.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Speaker Camacho: It seems to be that everybody here is aware of the purpose of the hearing and rather than to spend time waiting for some people to show up, we might as well go on to other matters for this Committee to decide on what we need to do.

Chairman Salii: I want simply to add that as we review all these different issues, the questions such as the ones raised by Mr. Torres and by Senator Amaraich, it is incumbent upon all of us to give thoughts to them so that when the time comes to report to Congress we would have given thoughts to them beforehand. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more.

Joaquin Torres: I would like to make a very brief comment, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. It has been my observation that the record of the Congress insofar as its efforts to cover the needs of the Marianas is not too good. There is a lot of fear expressed by the people of the Marianas and perhaps the Congress has done very little if any to brighten its image with regards to the people of the Marianas. It has been my observation that the people of the Marianas have a fear of being in the minority; there is fear of revenue sharing, fear on the use of funds and how they are to be distributed when a new government is formed. I think that the Joint Committee should give some thoughts to this because I think this was one of the major fears for pulling out from the rest of Micronesia. Like I say, the record of the Congress has not been too good and I would hope that the Joint Committee could give serious consideration to this. I feel that no matter what we do in the future we will still need each other and although we may not have the same aspiration, I hope that Micronesia will still be called Micronesia and it is my hope also that every effort is made to accommodate the needs of the Marianas and likewise the other districts. I feel that this is the only way that we can pursue our work for unity and unless the Congress is willing to do this, then our work toward unifying Micronesia would be worthless. Before closing, I would suggest that a summary of the hearings be produced so that the people of the Marianas and likewise the other districts would know what the feelings of the other districts are and I say that this is one means of establishing a dialogue amongst the districts. There is too much ignorance amongst the districts and I would hope that positive steps be taken by this Committee to establish this dialogue.

Speaker Camacho: In closing, I would urge the Committee to seek ways to have the Congress of Micronesia understand the intentions of the Marianas people and urge to let the Marianas continue on with its status talks with the United States. We would also like to have the Congress of Micronesia present to the constituents in the other districts an understanding of what we feel regardless of our political future. Again, we ask that you let the Marianas go on with its own negotiations provided however that we have to negotiate very carefully with the United States. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will understand what we feel about this and perhaps later on if any of the districts want to join us, we would welcome it. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Salii: Mr. Speaker, we have no more questions from this side of the table so we want to thank you and the rest of you who came to educate us. I will again state in response to the question raised by Mr. Guerrero that the transcript of this hearing will be made available. The hearings are also being taped in their entirety. There is agreement between the Broadcast people and the Committee that the tapes will be edited and the full hearing will be broadcast in response to what Mr. Torres raised. I believe the important message to the Committee this morning is that the Committee and the Congress of Micronesia try to understand the feelings of this district with respect toward its desire for separate status. We will wind up our hearings from this part of the Sub-Committee today after the public hearing. If there are any further communications that you, Mr. Speaker, or any member of this group wish to present to the Committee after we commenced the hearing, please feel free to do so. At the end of the hearing, it does not mean that the Committee has all the information which might be necessary before it reports to the Congress so I would urge all of you on behalf of the Committee that if there are any more communications that the members would like to send, please feel free to do so either directly to the Chairman of this Committee or the members or more possibly to Congressman Herman Guerrero or Senator Pangelinan. With this, I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and everybody for coming this morning.

Speaker Camacho: Before closing, I would like to request and urge members of the Joint Committee to request to the Congress of Micronesia to seek a way to expedite the ending of the Trusteeship Agreement because I feel that this is the only way to achieve our goal and that is by ending the trusteeship as soon as possible. Thank you very much.

Adjourned 11:11 a.m.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Hearing of the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Congress of Micronesia with the MARIANAS DISTRICT LEGISLATURE, at the District Legislature Building, 3:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 24, 1973, Susupe, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

Chairman Salii: President Santos, Honorable members of the Mariana Islands District Legislature, we will open this hearing between the legislators and the members of this Sub-Committee of the Joint Committee on Future Status. Our purpose is to listen to you and to receive ideas from the leaders of this district with respect to the future political status of this district and of the rest of the Trust Territory. We have been fortunate that the President and the Honorable Daniel Muna and other members of the District Legislature are also members of your Commission and they have attended the hearing held with the Sub-Committee yesterday and perhaps with their knowledge on the kind of information the Sub-Committee is interested in obtaining we can dispose of any lengthy discussion on our part or any repetition of the questions. I will ask members of my Committee if at any time during the hearing they want to ask questions or make comments, please feel free to do so. In the meantime, I will turn the meeting over to the President of the District Legislature and ask if they have any statement to present at this time.

President Santos: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am happy to present to the Committee the law establishing the Marianas Political Status Commission, and at this juncture, on behalf of the Marianas District Legislature, I wish to take this opportunity to thank you and the members of this Sub-Committee for the meeting with you this afternoon and to share with you the discussion on this very important endeavor for the benefit of the inhabitants of Micronesia. As you mentioned, your Committee met yesterday with the Marianas Political Status Commission and the members of the Marianas Status Commission indicated then their views on the Commission's separate negotiation with the United States Government. For the benefit of the members here who were not at the meeting yesterday, the Marianas Status Commission asked the Joint Committee and the Congress of Micronesia to assist us and to give us their blessings on these separate negotiations with the United States. Included, but not limited to one of the most important things discussed yesterday, is the fact that when the time comes for the plebiscite, the people of the Marianas will have to participate. I think this was clear in our discussions yesterday.

Chairman Salii: Thank you for briefing the members of the District Legislature on what happened yesterday. The Committee will receive your document which you have presented to us. Perhaps, at this point, before we go any further, I want to just ask members of the Joint Committee if they have any statements to make.

President Santos: May I just say this. District Legislature 3-124 delegates all the responsibilities to the Marianas Political Status Commission to make studies on the most appropriate political status for the Marianas, and according to the law, the Commission from time to time will

make its report on its deliberations to the District Legislature. The Marianas Status Commission has not completed its report encompassing the negotiation which was held the last time. We are hoping that the report will reach us before our next session in August. It is on this basis that the District Legislature has had no direct participation, except for the two members appointed by the District Legislature to participate in the Marianas Status Commission.

Chairman Salii: May I make a request from the Committee to the District Legislature that when you receive the report of your Commission we would like to receive a copy through the District Legislature. It is my understanding that the District Legislature does not have much in a way of communication to the Committee until the receipt of its Commission's report, but since we are here, let me ask members of our Committee if they have any questions or comments to make at this time.

No comments from any of the members of the Joint Committee at this time.

Mr. President, since you have some members here, would any of the wish to make any statement or ask questions to the Committee? I just want to make sure that we give everyone a chance to express themselves.

Vice-President Cabrera: What is the political aspiration of this Committee and how do you intend to adapt it to the Trust Territory?

Chairman Salii: The Committee is required under the law in which it was established to negotiate a type of relationship with the United States and that is a relationship which is labeled as "free association". It is a relationship that could be terminated by either side either from the beginning or after a period of time and this has occupied the attention of the Committee with its negotiations with Ambassador Williams. At the same time, since August of last year, the Committee has also been required by the Congress of Micronesia to look into the alternative of independence and make a report on the possibility of that to the Congress along with its work on free association. I believe that under the mandate of the Committee, the Committee is limited to the exploration of these two possibilities. We are reviewing the questions during these hearings whether more alternatives should be explored and whether the Committee should recommend to the Congress in its report on the result of these hearings that more alternatives should be looked into and perhaps the ballot should contain more than one status alternative. That question is being reviewed by the Committee as we go from community to community holding these hearings.

Julian Calvo: I just want to find out whether the United States Congress is aware of the creation of the Joint Committee on Future Status of the Congress of Micronesia.

Chairman Salii: Yes, the United States Congress has been advised of the creation

of the Joint Committee. The members of the Interior Sub-Committee from time to time are briefed on the progress of the negotiations with the United States Executive Branch. Also, the United States Senate and House Committee on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations are briefed on the progress of the negotiations to date.

Julian Calvo: What is their reaction in regards to your first and second talks between your Joint Committee and the United States; did you receive any favorable comments to encourage you to go on with your talks?

Chairman Salii: The last contact I made as Chairman of the Joint Committee with the people I mentioned on Capitol Hill--to summarize it, it is their feelings that they are willing to help resolve the problem. I think they were cautious to the extent that they do not want to reflect their positions during this time of the negotiations, and the message we seem to receive is that we cannot conclude anything with the Executive Branch without United States congressional participation. The impressions we have been able to obtain were taken through an informal consultation with members of the United States Congress; that there cannot be any official stand taken by the United States Congress until something is presented formally to them by the President of the United States. From time to time, a number of bills have been introduced by individual members of the United States Congress but there had been no action taken on any of them. I think the consensus of the congressional members is that they will wait until the President officially recommends something to them for their consideration.

Legislator Cruz: Mr. Chairman, I think free association status is being recommended for Micronesia, is that correct?

Chairman Salii: You are correct that the former Congress of Micronesia Status Commission and the Status Delegation recommended to the Congress the endorsement and adoption of the free association status. Based on those recommendations of the Status Commission and the Status Delegation, the Congress adopted the position that we should pursue negotiations along the lines of free association. That has been the position of the Congress up to now.

Legislator Cruz: Is this the first part of your hearings or the last?

Chairman Salii: This is the last part of the hearings by this Sub-Committee. We first went to Yap, Palau and now we are in the Marianas District. The other half of this Committee is in the Marshalls now.

Legislator Cruz: Are you working under two committees?

Chairman Salii: Yes, in the interest of saving time, we are operating in two committees, one going to the eastern districts and this group covering the western districts.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Frank Diaz: I do not know whether we are ready with some of the questions raised by some of the leaders in the other districts. It seems to me that many people in the other districts have also different opinions in regards to the position taken by the Committee and I was just wondering whether in your meetings with the districts they expressed any ideas as to their political status.

Chairman Salii: We will help each other explain as much as we can what the people in Yap and Palau told us. We cannot cover the other districts because we have not yet had any report from them. The leaders in Yap, and generally the population there, say that they support the concept of free association even though they do not exactly know what it is in detail, but they would like the Congress to continue to negotiate until there is something complete to present to the people and they always add that they themselves want to maintain the final say in what finally is accepted. This seems to be the message coming from Yap. On the land question, they said that the public land should be returned to the districts. If there is any possible way not to give land to the military and yet maintain association with the United States, we should pursue that; but if there is no possibility of obtaining free association with the United States without making land available to them, then the people would be willing to make land available to the military. Am I summarizing the situation in Yap correctly?

Senator Mangefel: Yes.

Chairman Salii: Their support of free association is based on the idea of unilateral termination at some point in time; in other words, the four principles of free association. In Palau, I would say it is basically the same story. The District Legislature right now is studying the desirability of direct talks with the United States. In our meetings with them, there were more statements to the effect that the people of Palau support the concept of free association and would ask the Congress to continue with the negotiations. I do not know why there was no mention of the study going on right now by their select committee, but I suspect that is because the select committee is going to present a report to the District Legislature in October and that there was nothing the select committee could say. With respect to their position on land, they said that they cannot consider making the option in Palau available to the United States military unless the lands are returned to the chiefs in trust to the people. On this point, there seems to be a great degree of unanimity with the District Legislature, the chiefs and the general population in Palau. There, again, they told us to continue what we have started to do but "just don't make any final commitments for us; we will make the final decision."

Legislator Cruz: What is the second alternative that the Joint Committee is anticipating if free association is not possible?

Chairman Salii: Right now, it would have to be independence under the mandate of this Committee. I do not know what would happen as a result of

030303

these hearings. If I may say so, we get a very different message from the Marianas hearings so far and that is we are asked at every meeting to recognize the separate negotiations being conducted by the Marianas and to sanction these separate talks for commonwealth. This is the message here. I do not think that we can say that for Rota. I will have to depend on the members of the Committee to help me evaluate this part. In Tinian, the Committee was presented with a resolution which said in effect that the people of Tinian will follow the political status desire of the people of Saipan and whatever status is negotiated by the Marianas Political Status Commission. This is what the people of Tinian desire to follow. At our meeting with the Commission yesterday, we posed the question, "If there is a very close similarity between what is negotiated by the Congress of Micronesia and that which is negotiated by the Marianas Political Status Commission, would there be any reason for the Marianas to stay within the unity of Micronesia?" It was expressed by one member of the Commission, and was not disputed by any other member, that even under those circumstances, the Commission asks that the Committee sanction its separate negotiations. At a meeting with the Speaker and members of the Municipal Legislature and with the District Commissioners this morning, the same question was posed. We essentially get the same response. So, at this point, before we sit down and evaluate the results of these hearings, and taking your sentiments into account, I will not be prepared to say whether this would affect the recommendation of this Committee to the Congress or not, but in response to the question on what do we do with the result of these hearings, I can say that we will point out the result to the Congress of Micronesia as accurately as we can report the situation in each of the districts when we make our report to the Congress during the next January-February session.

Frank Diaz: Is the Committee aware that the people of the Marianas have been trying to change their status since 1959 when they more or less wanted to unite with Guam? As time went by, the question of our political status changed and now we have the Marianas Political Status Commission negotiating for our future status. What I am trying to say is that it has been a long time since we have been trying to change our political status. We know that the outcome of the work being negotiated now will eventually be approved by the people through a plebiscite and we ask that the Congress of Micronesia give us its blessings in regards to our future political status.

Felipe Salas: Mr. Chairman, do all the districts, except the Marianas, have the same concept on the political status of Micronesia? I have heard that even in Truk there are two groups; one seeking for free association, the other seeking for independence.

Chairman Salii: Let me ask each member of the Committee if they would be kind enough to briefly give us a summary of his interpretation on the feelings of each district. I have briefly outlined what we believe to be the sentiments in Yap and Palau, but I will ask Senator Mangefel what he can say with regards to the people of Yap.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Senator Mangefel: In Yap, it is very hard to say--maybe there are 10 people who go for commonwealth, another 10 who go for free association, and still another 10 who go for independence, yet as far as I can say, most of the people support free association, but really there is always some difference. Some may want the status quo to remain as it is.

Congressman Balos: I think that the general feeling in the Marshalls is that they people support what the Committee is doing right now.

Felipe Salas: I did not follow what the congressman is suggesting.

Congressman Balos: Yes, the general feeling of the people in the Marshalls is to support what this Committee is doing insofar as looking into the free association status.

Senator Iehsi: As far as my district is concerned, the district legislature has not gone out with an official position on the status question. From the district's delegation to the Congress of Micronesia, there are one or two delegates who tend to favor independence; but the majority of the delegation members support free association. As far as the general public is concerned, the feeling is that it will wait and see what the Joint Committee on Future Status will come out with. There is no active opposition or active support for either free association or commonwealth or independence. What I am saying is that the general public supports what the Congress is doing. This is from the Ponape District.

Chairman Salii: In Palau, I would put it this way, if we ask the people now, I think we will get a majority of people who support free association, but if we ask them what they really want, they will say that they want the land back first; that they are reluctant to see the military come in unless they are able to sit down with them and talk terms, and they will probably say "you go ahead and bring back what you have negotiated and we will look into it". There has been a strong support for independence in Yap with the younger generation. In my own district, it is a matter of public record that the other senator from Palau has been advocating independence from the beginning, so it is hard to say what they want at this point in time, except that they would like the lands back and that they urge the Congress to continue its negotiations.

Senator Amaraich: I have been away too long from Truk so I don't know what is happening there. I think I can safely say that the general feeling of the people there is that they would expect the Congress to negotiate what is best for the people. If we ask them what they prefer, they will tell us that they have not seen the entire package of the negotiations and they would like more information on the other alternatives. We know that there are certain groups of people who called themselves anti-independence because they feel that at this time we are not ready to go in that route and they qualify their statements that free association is first and eventually independence will come along. We also hear voices in Truk saying that independence is the highest and best form of

government; therefore, it should not be ruled out as part of our studies on the kind of statuses for Micronesia. The District Legislature has not taken any position on the status question so we do not know what it feels about it. The general feeling in Truk is that the people should be given the opportunity to choose from 1-2-3 alternatives before they can comment or make a decision.

Daniel Muna: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You told us that the people of Palau agree to whatever the Congress of Micronesia's Political Status Committee is doing, and although they agree to that, they want the Committee to go back to them and show them the proposal that the Committee approves. In essence, it means that the people would have to make the decision. Now, I would like to ask in regards to the resolution adopted by the Congress of Micronesia which indicated that the Congress has the sole authority to negotiate on the political status of Micronesia. Could you explain to us what is meant by "sole authority". I have some doubts as to these words.

Chairman Salii: Yes, my interpretation of those two words would be--it is the opinion of the Congress that when it comes to the question of status, the Congress is the only authority that has jurisdiction over this matter and that is based on the Secretarial Order giving jurisdiction to the Congress in the area of external matters, so "sole authority" would mean the only agency that has the legal jurisdiction to handle external matters. That would be my interpretation. The Congress is faced with the idea of these separate talks not only for this district but eventually perhaps for other districts, and the question came up under the present authority of the Congress, "can the Congress of Micronesia give its sanction or authority to the district to undertake separate talks?" The legal staff of the Congress looked into this thing; our own consultant looked into this legal aspect, and it was their consensus even though there was dispute within the Committee, that if this Committee were to negotiate only for the five districts, anybody in Micronesia can take the Committee to court and nullify any action of the Committee because as a congressional committee, it has to deal with all the districts. Based on that recommendation, the position was taken by the Congress.

Daniel Muna: The question is since the people will have the final say-so on the status issue, I am a little concerned because the term "sole authority" is rather late.

Chairman Salii: I believe there are two different things here. I think the Congress is addressing itself to the negotiations.

Daniel Muna: Would it be possible to amend the resolution stating it in such a way to indicate that the final decision is up to the people?

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

- Chairman Salii: We will look into that. I do not recall of any bill or resolution to this effect. It has been expressed in the form of speeches and responses to questions, but it would be a good idea to put it into a form of a resolution. We will look into this matter. I really do not think it will be outside of this Committee to make the recommendation. It also says that the Committee should look into the possibility of independence; it does not limit it to independence or free association, but it does not enumerate any other besides the two.
- Ignacio Dela Cruz: I would like to ask you if you can define the word "sovereignty" and at the same time give us a little explanation regarding the word.
- Chairman Salii: As we interpret "sovereignty", it is the all inclusive power over a political unit which means that when we claim sovereignty for Micronesia, in this case, we are talking about the legal, political and moral power--authority and control over the political unit. This is what we mean in this context.
- Mr. White: It is the right of the people to govern themselves without any outside interference.
- Ignacio Dela Cruz : Right now, the United States Government wishes to have sovereignty over the Marianas District and at the same time they are offering the Marianas District full internal control. If we allow the United States Government to have sovereignty over the Marianas, could we exercise full internal self-government?
- Chairman Salii: We are at a disadvantage when you pull that question because we have not seen a specific language on the proposal part. Is the proposal for the Federal Government to have sovereignty over the Marianas and still have the Marianas to maintain their full internal control? My interpretation, and this has not taken any research on my part, is that to the extent that the Federal Government allows, that much can be exercised by the smaller unit in the bigger political entity. So, the answer is "yes" and "no". It is "yes" to the extent, let us say, that the Federal Government has sovereignty under the circumstances that you have described.
- Daniel Muna: The 50th State of the Union, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Guam--the United States has sovereignty over the 50th State and the territories. Although the United States has sovereignty over these areas, there was a case in regards to Puerto Rico in which the Congress of the United States wanted to enact legislation to control internal matters of Puerto Rico but Puerto Rico went on to say that the United States

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Congress cannot because the Puerto Rico Government has to mutually agree. This is the concept of mutual consent. I still believe that if the United States should have sovereignty over the commonwealth of the Marianas, the commonwealth of the Marianas should have the maximum self-government on internal matters.

Ignacio Dela Cruz: I would appreciate very much if the Committee would do more research on this matter because I think it directly concerns the Marianas. If you will permit me, I would like to ask my next question. Under free association, will the people have the right to control immigration, the free movement of outsiders in and out of an area?

Chairman Salii: Yes, the United States' proposal would make it that way.

Ignacio Dela Cruz: Would this have to be worked out between the United States and Micronesia?

Chairman Salii: The United States has said that travel and immigration should be subject to Micronesian law. For third countries, we have not concluded this thing, but they have agreed that travel and immigration both in and out will be subject to Micronesian law. Right now they are requesting that the final draft of that title give some preferential terms to the United States citizens for movement into Micronesia, but that has not been agreed to by this Committee. What both sides agreed is that travel and immigration will be subject to Micronesian law.

Ignacio Dela Cruz: Will the Committee respect the wishes of the Marianas for a separate status as contrary to the one being proposed by the Joint Committee, that of free association?

Chairman Salii: It will be premature for each of us to say anything on this. We are considering that very question right now. The only thing that any of us can say is that we will give it the necessary consideration that it deserves. We have been requested by the Marianas Political Status Commission and some members of the Saipan Municipal Legislature to respect the wishes of the Marianas people.

Ignacio Dela Cruz: The last question I have, would it be possible for the Marianas Political Status Commission to get some sort of financial assistance from the Congress of Micronesia?

Chairman Salii: My response will be along the same line as my last. That request was presented to the Committee to consider yesterday. It would be foolhardy for anyone of us to say whether funds can be made available or not. This Committee had a hard time getting funds for its constitutional convention and commission on national unity, so what this Committee recommends may not carry too much weight.

Felipe Salas: In regards to the financing of the Marianas Political Status Commission by the Congress of Micronesia, I think, yesterday, if

030308

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

I recall correctly, you stated that provided that the Marianas Commission will go along to participate on the referendum.

Chairman Salii: There were separate questions we raised, one of which was we asked what would be the position of the Marianas Political Status Commission to the idea of having the people of the Marianas also voting in the referendum containing whatever status alternatives the Congress negotiates. The response from the Commission Chairman is that it is the position of the Commission that both the Congress of Micronesia alternative and the Marianas Political Status Commission alternative will be presented to the people of the Marianas. The question about financing was not related to these two alternatives presented to the people of the Marianas.

Daniel Muna: Why is it that the people of Micronesia have to press that the Trusteeship Agreement be terminated?

Chairman Salii: There are people who want to terminate it. I for one do not see how we can terminate it if we do not get the cooperation of the Administering Authority. Inasmuch as I do not like to say it, I very frankly do not see how we can terminate it without the United States' participation.

Daniel Muna: Are you saying that the United States has the authority?

Chairman Salii: They have the power not to terminate it before the United Nations. I think that they can justify their participation on legal grounds. I do not see how they can justify it on moral grounds. I am only speaking for myself because the Committee has nothing to say on this. I am advised that the only way we can get out of it would be a simple declaration of independence.

Daniel Muna: Is it that simple?

Chairman Salii: I do not think it is simple by any means. I am talking about the legal aspect of it.

Ignacio Dela Cruz: Could each district be granted option to declare independence?

Chairman Salii: So far, I know--and I will rely on our legal counsel--it would be legally not possible under the trusteeship based on the policy of the Administering Authority and views expressed at the United Nations, that after termination, even if there is unity of several districts, it would depend on the agreement of federation or whatever the district decides to bind themselves with. I do not know the circumstances under which this will take place.

Ignacio Dela Cruz: For the record, I would like to emphasize the fact that for many years the people of the Marianas have been fighting to see the

termination of the Trusteeship Agreement and now that we are going in the right direction, I would like to ask the Committee to take special recognition of the fact and to recommend this in its report to the Congress.

Chairman Salii: Mr. President, I have consulted with members of the Committee and we have no more comments or questions to make, except to say that if there are any more questions or comments, we have a lot of time and we are prepared to go on with the meeting.

President Santos: Mr. Chairman, I believe you have an idea of what we want to express from this side of the table. The meeting this afternoon has been very fruitful and I think we are ready to close for this afternoon.

Chairman Salii: Let me say that you have raised some very tough questions and I am sorry I was not prepared to give answers, but let me assure you that we will refer the questions to our experts on the staff and hopefully the answers will be contained in our report to the Congress of Micronesia. Thank you very much.

Adjourned 4:40 p.m.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

Hearing of the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Congress of Micronesia with SAIPAN GENERAL PUBLIC, on Tuesday, July 24, 1973, at 8:30 p.m., in the Saipan Municipal Building, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

David Maratita: Good evening everybody. We apologize for the late meeting but we were hoping of getting more people this evening. I would like to introduce the Chairman of the Committee, Senator Lazarus Salii from Palau; Senator Andon Amaraich from Truk; legal counsel Mike White; Mrs. Evelynna Akimoto, secretary; Congressman Ataji Balos from the Marshalls; Senator John Mangafel from Yap; Senator Ambilos Iehsi from Ponape, and Sabo Ulechong, Senate Clerk.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am privileged to introduce to you the Joint Committee of the Congress of Micronesia. I will now turn over the meeting to the Chairman.

Chairman Salii: Thank you very much, Mr. Maratita. I would like to ask those people in the back to please move up front. We now call this hearing to order. This is the Joint Committee on Future Status holding hearing in the Marianas on the future status question. We have had a series of meetings in this district starting with Rota and Tinian and yesterday we met with the Marianas Political Status Commission and the Saipan Chamber of Commerce. This morning we met with the Mayor and the members of the Saipan Municipal Legislature and the district commissioners. This afternoon we met with the Marianas District Legislature. The meeting this evening is a public meeting and is open to any one here. We would like at the start of the meeting to give more chance to those people who may have been tied up and were unable to come in earlier. We will start now and if more people come in we may have to go back and let them in on what is going on. First of all, we are here to listen to the views of the people with respect to the future status question; with respect to their desires on commonwealth, free association or independence. I would like to open the floor at any time from this point on for anybody to make any statement to the Committee or to raise any questions they might want to raise. The Committee is interested in such questions as; should the districts be allowed to negotiate their future directly with the United States? Should the Congress continue to negotiate on behalf of Micronesia? What do the people feel should be done or should not be done with respect to this question? I see some people who have attended our meetings yesterday and today and I am glad to see them here again this evening. If they want to pursue the questions we have discussed in previous hearings, please feel free to do so. I would also like to make this announcement that since people were not prepared to appear before this Committee tonight due to various reasons, the Committee will be available tomorrow to receive all interested persons at the Congress Annex on Capitol Hill starting at eight o'clock tomorrow morning. I am glad to see those who are here tonight took the time to come here. You now have the opportunity to express your feelings on the status question before this Committee.

030311

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

- R. Villagomez: Isn't Senator Pangelinan supposed to be with this group?
- Chairman Salii: Senator Pangelinan is supposed to be with this Committee; unfortunately, he had to make a trip to Guam yesterday and has not returned.
- R. Villagomez: Could you give us the general opinion of the Congress of Micronesia concerning the separate negotiations being done by the Marianas Districts? Is there a general feeling of the Congress of Micronesia?
- Chairman Salii: During the last session in January-February, the Congress passed a resolution expressing its sense that the Congress is the sole authority to negotiate on the status question. The resolution passed; that represents the general idea.
- R. Villagomez: But that does not have any actual legal effect on the negotiations between the Marianas and the United States.
- Chairman Salii: We have not been able to prevent negotiations between the Ambassador and the Marianas.
- R. Villagomez: Is it the general feeling of the Congress of Micronesia to try and influence the negotiating team of the Marianas and the United States so that instead of continuing separate negotiations, join with the Congress of Micronesia and not only have the Congress of Micronesia negotiating with the United States?
- Chairman Salii: Since the session adjourned, there has been no discussion on this yet. I think that perhaps the only time that such a discussion can take place is next January when the Congress reconvenes. Up to now we have no efforts from the Congress as a whole to try to influence the Marianas Commission. This half of the Committee has been requested by the members of the District Legislature that we recommend to the Congress to give its blessings to the separate Marianas talks. We expect that after we wind up these hearings, one of the decisions is what to do with this request that has been presented to the Committee. Could I ask you what your feelings are with respect to the separate talks, whether you desire that or do you think that we should sanction it? What position would you recommend that this Committee or the Congress take?
- R. Villagomez: I have been thinking that perhaps it depends on the kind of questions that you would present to the people. I think there is a tendency to emphasize the political questions, presenting the problem to the people. There is also a great deal of emphasis on economic questions. But, I seem to observe that when you present economic questions to the people, when you ask the people whether they would like to progress in a sense that they would have higher salaries, better roads, better education, better hospitals, etc., the answer generally would be "yes" they would like that. Obviously, the people are aware that the Trust Territory Government or Government of Micronesia without the United States cannot as easily provide all these to the people as the United States can. If you present the problem like that, you will get mainly positive answers from the people by asking the relationship of closer

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

association with the United States. If you present the problem asking them to what extent do they want to have internal control, then they might have a different answer. I feel that where the problem comes in is to compare it with different political aspects and figure out the balance. You have to sacrifice one or the other. The important thing I feel is to try to present these problems in such a way that the people can see them separately, understand both sides, and be able to distinguish the advantages and the disadvantages of the problem and ask themselves which do they want to sacrifice for which, and in that way the people will be able to make a better decision for themselves. If you just come out and ask, "do you like commonwealth or independence or free association?" that is not going to help. This is my interpretation. The thing to do is try to present commonwealth in such a way that the people can understand the political aspects. Do the same thing with free association and independence. I feel that at this time the people are not aware of the definitions and characteristics of these various alternatives and therefore the people are not in a position to make competent judgments. If this Committee were to raise this status question to the people when the people have not been presented with the right kind of picture on the various alternatives, then this could be premature. That is probably why they did not show up because they probably don't know what they want. That seems to be our biggest problem.

Chairman Salii: I think this observation is very pertinent. I think to a large extent we are asking questions on what do you think of commonwealth, free association or independence, because the discussions to date are focusing mainly on the political side of these alternatives. When the package on free association is completed, we hope that we can sit down and be able to see that given this political situation, these are the economic conditions we insure giving; commonwealth, the same thing. I think that the only way to continue a meaningful political education program is to tell the people this.

R. Villagomez: What kind of plans do you have for setting up methods of educating the people? Are there going to be written materials or is the work going to include a TV program? Would this be too difficult for the Congress of Micronesia?

Chairman Salii: No, I do not think so. I think it can be a relatively easy task. Right now these political alternatives are still being defined. I think part of the problem is that the administration is reluctant to go into this area because they might be accused of propagandizing. At every round of the negotiations, the proceedings in their entirety have been published and at least those should be translated and broadcast over the radio and published in the local language so that the people will be able to read it. We have found out that even if you publish this into the local language, it is still not too helpful because the background information is not there. I am convinced that giving the materials to them without further explanation is not too helpful for the people.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

- J. Sablan: Since the birth of the Congress of Micronesia and up to the present time, I would like to ask you as members of the Congress of Micronesia whether there is a sense of unity amongst the Micronesian congressmen?
- Chairman Salii: I think so. I think that where there is a living evidence of Micronesian unity, it is in the Congress.
- J. Sablan: My question directs specifically not in theory but in a practical sense.
- Chairman Salii: My answer is still "yes".
- J. Sablan: Throughout your visits in the districts, is there a desire amongst the people of Micronesia to unite?
- Chairman Salii: Let's refer the question to all the members of the Committee and we'll let them speak for their districts and I will speak for my district. Senator Iehsi, would you please give us your feeling on what the people of Ponape feel with respect to any desire to remain united with the rest of Micronesia?
- Senator Iehsi: There is no question on the desire of the people of Ponape to stay within the unity of Micronesia. No one has said anything about breaking away. I think I can safely say that the people in my district are asking questions as to why the Marianas is breaking away and why the other districts are talking about going on their own. While I cannot speak for the other districts, maybe they have reasons for doing what they have undertaken. As to whether my district values a united Micronesia, I can say "yes".
- J. Sablan: My other question is throughout your observations amongst the people here in Micronesia, did you observe any contradictions?
- Senator Iehsi: I would say definitely you'll find the different views in every district. We don't have to go farther than outside of Saipan; you see it happening here. I can say that from our trips to Yap and Palau, I observed the general feeling as favoring a united Micronesia.
- J. Sablan: How are you going about uniting these people in Micronesia? Assuming that there is no sense of unity amongst the people of Micronesia and as leaders of Micronesia, how would you solve this problem? You mentioned about political education. Would that be sufficient? Would that be an effective way, or do you think we have to wait let us say 10-20 more years?
- Senator Iehsi: I would say that in a unity, the people who get together to unite generally all of them want to get something out of the unity and that if somebody is not satisfied then it tends to pull out of it. You asked whether we have a way of uniting the people of Micronesia. I personally do not know but the way of doing it is by getting the people and asking what kind of government they would

like to have. I am sorry to say that the bill on constitutional convention was not adopted at the last session of Congress. We talk about a united Micronesia but we do not know because we do not have a constitutional bill and I think that if all the districts get together and participate in drafting a constitution that all the districts would feel that its interest is being protected in that constitution and in this way we may have a united force. This is my own personal opinion.

- J. Sablan: You are saying in effect that until that time when we draft our own constitution we will not have a sense of unity?
- Senator Iehsi: I am not saying that there is no sense of unity. I think that sometimes we overemphasized our differences and overlooked our similarities. I think it would be unfair to say that there is no sense of unity amongst the people of Micronesia; at the same time, we cannot say that there are no differences.
- J. Sablan: We do have contradictions amongst ourselves.
- Senator Iehsi: Yes, I grant you that is true, and it happens everywhere, here in Micronesia, in the United Nations, even in the United States.
- Senator Mangefel: I think that Senator Iehsi has spoken for Yap when he said that the people of Yap advocate a united Micronesia.
- Congressman Balos: I don't have much to say on this. I think at this point in time the Marshallese people will stick to what the Committee is doing now and that is they support what the Committee is doing, so I take it that we are still with the other districts.
- Senator Amaraich: I don't think there is any question in Truk that they hope that we can stay together, and I have stated publicly that I favor a united Micronesia and if there are problems that should be resolved or some of them that cannot be resolved by the Congress of Micronesia alone, that we take the efforts of all the leaders and the population, including myself and everybody else. One of the things that is emphasized is "let us try to keep together", and I support that, and I hope we can be successful in this effort.
- Senator Mangefel: I am not sure that we are really talking about the same unity here. In my opinion, unity does not necessarily mean that everybody should be together, act alike, do things exactly alike. In fact, I would not stand for that kind of unity. Unity to me is the very fact that we accept our own cultures, if you want to put it that way, although I would like to put it as our "differences" and be together and see how we can help each other. That is all it takes in my kind of unity. I don't want to see, for example, a person here to dress like a Yapese and vice versa. I don't want that to be imposed upon me, but the very fact that it exists, that alone is unity to me and that is the kind of unity I am talking about because we are located in the same area in the Pacific, and by joining hands together, I feel that we can put up a strong front against outsiders, but if we let the outsiders go at us individually we would not stand any chance at all.

- Audience: Do you feel that your own personal definition of unity applies to the understanding of the majority of Micronesians?
- Senator Mangefel: I cannot really say for sure. I don't know what the people's definition of unity is, and as I said, this is my own personal opinion.
- Audience: So I think the previous question that was asked is what should the Committee or the leaders of the Congress of Micronesia intend to do? Should it go on? Should it necessitate that the Micronesian people be directed toward unifying a group of people? What kind of action should be taken by the leaders in order that such a question be materialized with regards to your definition of unity?
- Senator Mangefel: I think education is the answer. It is very unfortunate that this is the first time in five years that you and I have had a chance like this. Had we been talking like this, we would be in a better position to understand each other.
- Chairman Salii: If I may add, I think that where we know the specific reasons why a district wants to separate, it is easy to focus attention on that problem. For instance the case of the Marshalls' desire to undertake separate negotiations on their own and I think a possibility of eventually separating from the rest of the Trust Territory, is based on the fact that they are not getting back in the way of revenue that goes into the Congress of Micronesia. If that is the only reason for separating, then it is a problem to deal with because the Congress might easily decide to give more revenues back to the Marshalls than to the other districts for that matter. Where you have a situation as perhaps exists in this district where because of lack of association in the past with the other districts and perhaps then it is on this reason that this district wants a closer affiliation with Guam or with the United States, perhaps there is nothing the Congress can do with respect to keeping this through unity. So, if there is this basic problem which exists, it is very difficult to handle it but where a problem is not a basic one as the example I gave of the Marshalls, it might be more easily handled. So, in order for the districts to remain united there's got to be at least in our minds a feeling that the best interests are safeguarded through unity.
- I will say for Palau, in response to the question, that first of all the District Legislature of Palau is studying the question whether it will be desirable for Palau to undertake separate talks with the United States. First, I believe it is based on this factor, that one of the Marianas District is talking about right now conducting separate talks with the United States; second, the Marshalls are talking about separate talks with the United States, so Palau better start preparing itself for this eventuality because the people feel that perhaps there is no longer any unity if the Marshalls and the Marianas got out of the Territory and they want to be prepared. But, when we asked them what is their desire, they said that they hope that the present boundary of Micronesia is preserved.

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

For those who just came in, the Committee is interested in receiving statements expressing their feelings on the status question from anybody here tonight. We also will be entertaining any questions that you might raise. We want to know the feeling of the people on such questions that we have been discussing whether it is desirable to maintain the unity of all the six districts, and if so, what positive steps can the Congress do to insure unity. We have also in previous hearings discussed the pros and cons of allowing military into Micronesia. These are the kinds of things that we would like to receive expressions on.

J. Sablan: Does the Congress of Micronesia, especially the Joint Committee have any formula to maintain unity?

Chairman Salii: We had proposed a Commission on National Unity to study ways in which the unity in Micronesia can be strengthened. We had been told that some districts are talking about separate negotiations because of their problems with the Congress of Micronesia where they are not getting enough attention from the Congress. Some districts feel perhaps that they are in the minority in this regard. This Committee feel that such a commission could give some attention to this problem and be able to recommend to the High Commissioner positive steps to be taken. The purpose of the commission is to stop any program that was working against the unity of Micronesia. Such a commission did not pass the Congress the last time.

R. Villagomez: I had an opportunity to have a visit with Secretary Carpenter in Washington and we started talking about the position of the Congress and the Marianas and at the very end they expressly indicated that the desire of the United States is to make all of Micronesia a part of the United States as soon as possible. Whether to make it a territory or commonwealth is not really an important question but the important thing is that Micronesia be a part of the United States as soon as possible, and they indicated that allowing the districts to negotiate separately may be one of the means of expediting their desires. Then from that Office, we went down to the Office of Williams and they gave us the same view. When we first got there we tried to scare them by saying, "we are setting up a plan to get university students to work against the separate negotiations with the Marianas, etc." They told us that this was a very poor thing to do. Anyway, the point I want to make is that the United States wants to expedite making Micronesia a part of the United States and they think that separate negotiations is a means of accomplishing this. My observation with the University students is that it is strictly for Micronesia as a whole to bargain with the United States. The majority of the Micronesian students feel that the negotiations should be slowed down. We want to go forward in such a pace that we can develop ourselves so that as we progress, we are also developing ourselves to take the type of developments that correlate with it. This is my personal feeling and the biggest disadvantage of the negotiations is that it is going to speed up the agreement of the United States and Micronesia. I think it should be slowed down, it should not be stopped, but it should be slowed down. I support the negotiations for the entire Trust Territory and I feel that it is not correct to say that all of the people in the Marianas desire the

030317

commonwealth status.

Audience: I think that unity should not only be pursued by the Congress of Micronesia; it should also be pursued by the Administering Authority.

J. Mafnas: I, personally, and a good number of my friends advocate unity in Micronesia, and I think the problem here is political education. Our education system is not geared to the standards that we have in Micronesia. Due to lack of education, lack of understanding of the Ponapean custom, of Yap, of Palau, our people tend to feel that we cannot unite. In traveling to all the districts, I did not encounter any problems with the Ponapeans, the Yapese, the Trukese, the Marshalllese. I accept the Palauans, the Yapese, the Trukese. I was born in Yap, and if I grew up in Yap, I probably would have worn a thu too. It is a matter of adjustment. I am accepted for being a Saipanese. I think the statement that the majority of the people in the Marianas advocates commonwealth is a misleading statement. It is very misleading and I am saying this based on my experience with involvement in local practices here in the Marianas. I have some reservations about commonwealth. I have greater reservations about reintegration with Guam. I have some reservations about free association too but I believe that if our leaders will unite, the Congress of Micronesia, the district municipal legislatures and iron out these differences, I feel that free association is the most appropriate status for Micronesia. On the distribution of revenues, I think it should be shared equally by all of Micronesia. This is one key factor of keeping unity in Micronesia. I want to repeat again, Mr. Chairman, that the statement on the majority of our people in the Marianas advocating commonwealth is a misleading statement. Thank you.

Ben Fitial: I understand that there is a commission established by the Congress of Micronesia on political education. What has happened to this commission?

Chairman Salii : There is a question whether this commission exists. The Commission was created during the special session in Ponape. There was no re-appropriation for the Commission to carry out its function. There were then some doubts whether it was proper to go ahead and appoint the membership of the Commission. Some appointments were actually made but because there has been no money, the Commission has been inactive since its creation.

Ben Fitial: As Mr. Mafnas pointed out, political education is what we need not only in this district but perhaps in the whole of Micronesia. I also heard rumors that the Administration may create a commission to function as such for political education.

R. Villagomez: I would personally support an effort by the Congress of Micronesia to influence the Marianas delegation in such a way as to cause them to not exactly change their minds, but more to have a feeling to be part of the Joint Committee. I feel that terminating separate negotiations and continuing with the Congress of Micronesia's negotiations would

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

have a stronger power as a negotiating team with the United States?

- J. Mafnas: Does the Committee have any intention of introducing a measure on constitutional convention this coming session?
- Chairman Salii : The bill as you may recall passed the Senate and if reintroduced at the Fifth Regular Session, it will still be alive.
- J. Mafnas: The reason why I asked is that I think there was a move that the Marianas, should that bill pass the Congress, would be excluded from this convention, and I feel, Mr. Chairman, that if the Congress ever permits something like that to happen, then the Congress will be doing an unfair thing to the Marianas, at least to those who believe in unity for Micronesia.
- R. Villagomez: I have seen unity. There are approximately 500 University students in Guam and that is where I went to school and I have seen them establish an executive committee where all districts are represented and decisions were primarily made by the executive committee on the various programs that we have throughout the school year. I have seen Micronesians cooperate and able to communicate, so maybe if you go down to a certain level, it may not work, but I know that unity in Micronesia can work effectively.
- David Maratita: I think the crucial question is Micronesian unity. Now, I personally believe that we are lacking an understanding of the word unity. In other words, what are we looking for? To me, I think the important thing is trying to identify ourselves. Are we trying to make Micronesia be identified as directly Micronesia in a sense of world recognition? What are we trying to achieve? The aim here in Micronesia is to find our identity first. The point on political education, I believe that a formal political education commission must be established, and what we are doing now is in itself a political education. We are going around to various districts meeting with the people and trying to get their points of view and at the same time they are getting our points of view. I believe that there should be more public meetings like this where we have the exchange of views which constitutes the basis for political education. If the Congress should try to identify the alternatives of the political status for Micronesia, be it independence, free association, commonwealth or what not, perhaps with enough interest from this group, we can always discuss this matter and this will generate more involvement, I believe. I would urge the Committee that perhaps next session of Congress you have a political education where there should be more local people involved.
- R. Villagomez: Another very crucial question raised earlier is why does the Marianas District want to negotiate separately? Why do they want commonwealth? You mentioned that perhaps if we know the answer to the question, we may be able to deal with the problem. One possible answer that I can think of: a Saipanese has several examples to look at. One of them would be Guam. He would look at Guam and he would look at Palau, Ponape, Yap or some other villages and he would compare these different places. Seeing that this guy has a wooden house while a guy in Guam has a big car and a nice house, you would ask the Saipanese

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

which would he prefer? Naturally, he would prefer Guam. The next question is how could he obtain that which he prefers? I feel that is one of the reasons why the Marianas District feels the way it does now. My question now is if we want to prevent the Marianas District from separating from the Trust Territory, we would have to tackle that particular problem. The question is, how? Would the Trust Territory be able to meet the kind of desire that the Marianas want to obtain from Guam, Hawaii, etc. Does the Congress of Micronesia have any discussions in this particular point? Do they just see this as a disadvantage that is too difficult to resolve? I feel that as long as there is no way that you can tell the Marianas people that they cannot obtain such a desire, it would be very difficult to unite.

J. Mafnas: In connection with Mr. Villagomez' comment, one of my dissatisfaction with the Marianas Commission is that even up to now I have not heard any single disadvantage of commonwealth. Perhaps, if the Commission presents the advantages as well as the disadvantages and lets the people in the Marianas see these, then they can make a good and sound decision.

Chairman Salii: I think it is incumbent on the Congress to really find out what is the real reason behind the Marianas, the Marshalls and Palau wanting to separate. I go back to the suggestion that the Committee made to the Congress of Micronesia that an organized effort to look into the matter of strengthening the unity of Micronesia be launched before it is too late, and that is this commission on national unity or other program that will discuss this sort of thing. I am getting to be convinced more and more that the economic side of the coin has been neglected and that is what might be making it difficult for the people to make any decision.

R. Villagomez: Does the Marianas delegation ever indicate to the Congress of Micronesia that they truly represent the will of the people of the Marianas when they negotiate for commonwealth?

Chairman Salii: We have not questioned them. At our meeting this morning with the members of the Municipal Legislature mention was made that about 85% of the people of the Marianas want this close association with the United States.

J. Sablan: I did not have the opportunity to read fully the Compact on free association. Can sovereignty remain in Micronesia?

Chairman Salii: Under the Compact so far there is the question as to whether during the free association status actual sovereignty resides in Micronesia. That is in the form of interpretation of the Compact. Under the provisions of the Compact now, certain aspects of Micronesian sovereignty are delegated under the United States Government voluntarily on the part of Micronesia but this is a temporary nature. Micronesia can take all of it back from the United States in the future so on that basis you might argue that sovereignty is still preserved in the Micronesian people. Some of us in the Committee maintained that we are giving away too much of our sovereignty to the United States and because we are giving too much, this might endanger our

ability to handle our internal affairs without interference. We have been asking the question whether we should attempt to change the language in future negotiations. We really have no idea whether the people will accept what the Committee has tentatively agreed to in the three Titles that we have negotiated. I will say that under the area of foreign affairs, the United States has full authority in that area. When we come to the Title of Foreign Affairs again it is a matter of interpretation. You can say that in the final analysis the United States will have full control over Micronesian foreign affairs because the provision there says that "United States treaties shall apply to Micronesia", and also the other provision which states that "if in the view of the United States Government any action by the Government of Micronesia in the area of foreign affairs which it may refuse basically in terms of defense, Micronesia will be required to terminate such action on the advice of the United States." Specific language states that "The Government of the United States will promptly notify the Government of Micronesia if it appears that any proposal or activity of the Government of Micronesia pursuant to this Annex conflicts with the international commitments, responsibilities or policies of the Government of the United States. . . ." That language gives the United States full freedom in the final analysis to control our foreign affairs. It is pertinent to mention some of the things listed in Annex A: "The Government of Micronesia may seek associate or other appropriate membership for which Micronesia may be eligible in regional organizations, United Nations Specialized Agencies. . . ."; "The Government of Micronesia may negotiate and conclude in the name of Micronesia, agreements of a cultural, educational, financial, scientific or technical nature. . . ." "The Government of Micronesia may establish temporary or permanent representation of Micronesian trade or other commercial interests in foreign countries. . . ." We would hope that before these things are finalized, and before we are committed to them, that we all review them and see whether we can accept them or not. We are at a disadvantage when we negotiate and their proposal is presented to us and we are unable to point to any section and say "this will be unacceptable to our people". If we are forced to negotiate more or less on our interpretation of what might be acceptable, we are in a weak position when we actually negotiate.

J. Sablan : On the subject of defense, there is a provision which says that the United States may invite military from other countries to form military activities here in Micronesia. How do you feel about that?

Chairman Salii: I feel that once you let the United States have certain lands and waters available in Micronesia for defense purposes, once you make this consensus, it follows that allies of the United States can come in. Under the language of this Compact, they may come in, and if the United States decides to hold joint maneuvers in Micronesia with the Australian Navy, under the language of the Title, they would be allowed to do so. I might say that because we would not know whether the Congress will accept the language in the Compact, we made it very clear, and it is very clear to the United States team, and on our part, that all these provisions are contingent on the agreement of the other provisions and as against the other provisions that have not been negotiated so far. I feel that the Titles in this Compact

are very much satisfied in favor of the United States. Their basic interest in the Compact will be in the areas of foreign affairs and defense. We feel that we are making a big sacrifice in giving them what we have given them. We hope that they will be as generous in the services that they will agree to give to Micronesia in return. We hope that they will be as generous in the area of financial compensation to Micronesia but this remains to be seen. We maintain the option that if we are not satisfied with what they will give us in this area, we will not agree to what we have given in foreign affairs and defense.

J. Sablan: I will not agree with that provision in which the United States may invite France to test bombs on Tinian or somewhere on the islands of Micronesia.

Chairman Salii: In fairness to the United States side, it is my interpretation, and with the feeling of the Committee, that they have said that while they can do considerably with what they intend to do with the military activities, that they have given their assurances that nuclear weapons, chemical and biochemical weapons will not be stored in the Micronesian waters and soils.

R. Villagomez: What about the desires of the people of Palau to have their lands returned to them before any agreement is reached? Does that hamper the negotiations?

Chairman Salii: It does have the effect of postponing the next round of negotiations. The Committee has taken the position that unless the Ambassador responds positively to the leaders of Palau, that this Committee will not be ready to meet for the next round. We have been asking the people in all the districts what they feel about the return of public lands. Let me report that basically, at least in this district so far, the people have said that they do want the public lands returned. It is not very clear yet unless we evaluate the transcript whether the lands be returned to the districts or municipalities. It is my interpretation that the lands be returned to the municipalities in the Marianas.

Audience: What is the Committee's bargaining power in the case of such a status (free association)?

Chairman Salii: We keep insisting that all we are asking is within our legal and moral rights; that the Trusteeship Agreement gave us the right to ask what we want. Secondly, what we are asking the United States is not unreasonable, in view of what they want. First: To exclude any other country from coming into Micronesia; and second, possibly making areas in Micronesia available to them for military purposes, which not only has the effect of forcing Micronesia to live alongside troops, perhaps, alongside dangerous weapons, but at the same time making Micronesia a target of any enemy of the United States. We are within our rights to ask the United States whatever we are asking and that when we look at it, we are asking a very minimal thing. We are not asking for any foreign aid or directing that we have a quid pro quo where we give something in return. We have taken the position of negotiating on an equal basis, and we have not negotiated from a lower position with the United States.

030321

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

R. Villagomez: When Ambassador Williams said "we are not here on a quid pro quo basis", did you believe that statement?

Chairman Salii: I don't know that he said that. The position of this Committee in our negotiations with him is that we are not asking for anything gratis. What we are asking for is indirect payment for what we may agree to give him.

D. Quitugua: What is the United States' interest in bargaining or negotiating such a political status (free association)? What is the interest for indicating such a status?

Chairman Salii: I think the basic interest of the United States has been made clear on the kind of things they request. The main thing would be for them to keep third countries from coming into Micronesia. That is the main U. S. requirement. Whether they have bases here, it seems to be obvious that they do not want to see anybody come in here. I would say that they are willing to terminate the Trusteeship Agreement because it would mean that there will be no more annual reviews or visiting missions from the United Nations coming here and then embarrassing them in front of the United Nations. They want that out of the way and then they will be able to handle their own requirements. I cannot see how they would have economic requirements in Micronesia. We are a very small nation to provide them in the way of resources, requirements that they might have in Micronesia.

R. Villagomez: What about possible business interests of American businessmen in developing Micronesia?

Chairman Salii: Insofar as it is a factor, influencing the position of the United States, it is negligible.

D. Quitugua: I am trying to follow as much as possible the advancement of the negotiations and the interests of both parties, and it seems to me that there is a little bit of interference between both parties; the interest of the Congress of Micronesia negotiating for self-determination, and the interest of the United States negotiating for military requirements. In connection with lands in Micronesia, it seems to me just from reading the PDN that in Palau, for example, the leaders will not allow future negotiations unless lands are returned to the appropriate individuals and compensations are made accordingly. It seems to me that if that is the bargaining power of the Committee, then future negotiations will be hampered because of such an attitude taken by an individual district where the interest of the United States lies. This is also true with the Marianas and the Marshalls. It seems to me that these districts where the military requirements are, are now fighting for the release of all public lands. It seems to me that there is a little bit of interference in the negotiations as far as the power to bargain goes.

Chairman Salii: I think we can say that to some extent it does limit the power of the Congress to negotiate with the United States, but it's

as opposed to having the United States maintain its eminent domain power for negotiations. I personally think that if lands are returned to the districts, we will be in a better position to negotiate with the United States.

Audience: The next round of negotiations will be in October. I am a little bit lost...

Chairman Salii: I think you have a good reason to be wondering. It has been discussed by the two chairmen, Ambassador Williams and myself, whose job it is to recommend such things as timing and site. Anyway we have discussed possibilities for planning purposes to meet not before the end of September because neither side will be ready before then. The Ambassador has suggested Truk. We have inquired with the leaders of Truk whether they will host the next round of talks. We have not received any response from Truk yet so nothing is definite as to the date or site of the next round.

RECESS (10 minutes)

R. Villagomez: When I was talking about the Marianas people mainly about advancing economically, you said if that is the main problem, and the problem is not a willingness to integrate, that we could solve the problem.

Chairman Salii: I was going to say that if the desire to separate is based on a series of difficulties, perhaps, economical factors, I would say that if this is basically the reason, if the Congress has a real understanding on the thinking of the people, that is the first step I would say of getting to suggest or thinking of ways to solve the problem, by the knowledge that this is what makes the people want to separate. I will say the chances of at least a meaningful dialogue are better than if it were when a district concludes that no matter what the ^{then} conditions are, it is in the best interest to be separated. It would/see^{then} to me that there is very little that can be done to change the situation.

If I may, I would like to summarize what we have received this evening. My summary will be subject to the actual discussions that took place. First, that it was suggested that the Congress look into the economic side of the various political alternatives and that this be explained to the people in a political education program along with the political situation before the people are asked to make any meaningful decision on this question. Second, the impression received by the Committee is that the statement that all the people of this district desire a status of commonwealth with the United States is a misleading statement. Third, that before we can really discuss these various issues relating to the future status question, that we have first to decide what it is we really want; whether we want to have the rest of the world recognize and respect our identity as Micronesians. If that is our desire then we should make the decision first and then look into the possibility of strengthening Micronesia's national unity, the problem being that perhaps we really do not know what we are aiming for. There were also expressions of the desirability of the Congress continuing

the negotiations for the entire territory; that perhaps with the separate Marianas talks there should be at least some attempts made to stop them. I would like to pause here now and ask the members of the Committee if they have any questions or comments to make at this point before we close this hearing.

Senator Iehsi: A statement was made that maybe one of the fears the people have is that when we are united some districts may find themselves in the minority group; that because some of the districts are already in the minority, it was implied that maybe the Administration is not fair in sharing the positions or the dollars that come to Micronesia, and, therefore, this may be the reason why the feeling of unity is not strong. I would say that while this may be true, we also have some uniting factors that maybe we sometimes overlook. I can point to some examples. I can say that a person from this district is the chief executive for one of the biggest districts in the Trust Territory, that is the Distad Truk. I can also say that our personnel officer in Ponape is a Saipanese, and the personnel officer for this district is a Ponapean. The Deputy Distad for the Marshalls is a Yapese. So, maybe if we all work together and try to see our common interest, we can do something about our unity. Mr. Roman Villagomez asked this Committee to do something about the negotiations that are going on in this district. I would say that maybe you are in a better position to do something about it than I can. Personally, I am very glad that I came to this meeting this evening because the impressions I got since yesterday up to noon today was that 85 per cent of the people here in the Marianas support commonwealth. That is all I have to say.

Senator Mangefel: There is also a fear expressed by some people that by uniting Micronesia, a well-progressed district might slow down because of the other underdeveloped districts. I would hope that whatever type of government we may have in the future, and as Chairman Salii pointed out, it will recognize the desires of the people that they don't want to slow down. As for me, to have a new kind of government means to be able to slow down and control the progress, but I certainly do not want it if the majority of the people want to progress at a full speed. If this is so, I shall give my blessing 100 per cent.

Congressman Balos: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a very brief comment. I would like to tell the people here that the meeting we have had tonight to me has been very informative, educational and helpful in that I got to know the people's views and desires on certain points. I would like to say that maybe at this point in time it is very important for us to still work together and try to find out what is good for the people of Micronesia. For myself, I wish I knew all the answers now so that I can say that "this is the good one to follow", but I don't know what is good yet, and I think that with the cooperation of the people of Micronesia, we can come out with something where we can make the future of Micronesia a better one.

Senator Amaraich: I really don't have much to say. As I stated before on record, and I have stated many many times that I hope we can keep the district together. Don't ask me why. I just feel it inside of me that that

is what I want. Statements have been made throughout the hearings we have had in the districts, not only here, but in Yap and Palau, asking what the Congress is doing to promote unity in Micronesia and sometimes I get the impression that many people think that only the Congress should make the efforts to preserve or promote unity. I think this is something that everybody should be working on if everybody feels the same way as I do. It is true that the Congress has been in operation for a number of years, but it is also true that during all this time, the Congress' power, its authority, has been very limited and, therefore, I think that when the Congress directed this Committee to look into free association, it had in mind the fact that it wants to have a chance to try and see if it can make it work because under the present system there are certain limitations that we are faced^{with}, and it was recommended that we go into free association where we will be able to run our own government and at the same time get some assurance in getting financial help. We can then get a crack at it and try to promote unity at the same time. If after we have tried this for a while and it still cannot work, then we can say that it cannot work and try for something else. Given a choice of where you want to go, I think this is the step that the Congress must concern itself about because under the present system there are things that we want to do but are very difficult to obtain because we must first get the final word from Washington. I remember the first session of Congress on Saipan at a reception where the late Chief Petrus Mailo was asked to make a speech and he said, "We have been under the Spanish, they were not able to develop these islands. We have been under the Germans, it was impossible for them to develop us. We have been under the Japanese, they have not been able to develop us, and under the American Administration, they still cannot do it." He concluded that "it is up to us, and we are the only people who can make it." I sort of believe in that statement, and I hope that we the people of Micronesia can be given the chance to try if we can make it. There are certain things that, perhaps, as the Chairman pointed out, would be difficult for the Congress to accommodate. If some people in the districts feel that they are in the minority, I don't see that as a problem because I feel that as a member of the Congress, I can make the change and I can make the sacrifice. If Saipan wants more money, then we can give it to them really because I don't want money to be the thing to divide us. If you need more people to be on the top, then we will be willing to give that. Yes, if you want to be the High Commissioner and I am still in the Congress I will give you that. But, if you say that you look down at people because they are in the lower class, then I do not know how to solve that. In order for us to try and keep the districts together, we need the support of the people, and I am glad that even though there are thousands of people on Saipan, we still have about 18-20 people in this public meeting and I am not disappointed about it. I am happy that this number of people care enough to show up and I hope that we can keep this kind of interest growing and increasing. My feeling is that if there is still a chance for us to explain things to the people, we will try it. As the Chairman pointed out, we will be on Saipan until tomorrow, but if there are still more questions, I am willing to stay up all night to hear them. But, don't expect the Congress to do everything because as I get the impressions from

some of the people here tonight, they think differently from their leaders, and although you may be in the minority group, you can still go to your representatives and make yourselves known. The points that have been made tonight are very important.

Chairman Salii: Thank you, Senator. This will be the last of our hearings here in this district. I can only say that the sentiments expressed by the Senator happened to reflect my own personal views. Let me emphasize again that even though the hearings will formally close, we still have until January to review the situation before we make our report on these hearings to the Congress. Between now and then, if anybody in this group, in this district, or any of the other districts, has anything more to add to what has already been given to the Committee, we hope that they will do so. For the people who showed up tonight, I will say that this has been a very helpful meeting to the Committee insofar as it gave us another side of the situation in the Marianas. I want to thank all of you for coming tonight. On behalf of the Committee, I want to thank you again. This meeting is now closed.

Adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Hearing of the Sub-Committee (Western Districts) of the Joint Committee on Future Status of Congress of Micronesia with the UNITED CAROLINIAN ASSOCIATION, on Wednesday, July 25, 1973, at 3:15 p.m., in the Senate Chamber, Congress of Micronesia Annex, Saipan.

Present: Chairman Lazarus E. Salii
Senator Andon Amaraich
Senator Edward DLG. Pangelinan

Michael A. White, staff attorney
Evelyna T. Akimoto, secretary

UNITED CAROLINIAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. Felix Rabauliman
Mr. Ben Fitial
Mr. Joe Lifoifoi

Chairman Salii: Senator Ambilos Iehsi went to cancel the bookings for his children who were supposed to leave with him tomorrow. We will start the meeting with the three of us, with the counsel and stenographer. Before we start, we have decided to schedule another hearing here. We were informed that your people wanted to meet with the Committee but because they were under the impression that the Committee would not have time to meet, that you did not press your request. I had informed Mr. Lifoifoi that the Committee is going to be here today and we would be happy to meet with you and others who may be interested in contacting the Committee. The Committee will note the presence of Mr. Felix Rabauliman, Mr. Ben Fitial and Mr. Joe Lifoifoi. I will give you the opportunity now to make any presentation you wish to make to this Committee.

Mr. Rabauliman: Thank you for giving this group an opportunity to meet with you. This group is the executive members of the United Carolinian Association (UCA). We urge the Joint Committee to consider all the issues of the political question and also to consider the ethnic group that exists in the Marianas regardless of whatever political status it undertakes. I will now ask my members if they have any statement to make.

Mr. Fitial: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make one thing clear to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, and that is the position taken by the UCA with regards to the political status issue in which we give our full support to what the Commission has endorsed; that is the Political Status Commission of the Congress of Micronesia. As you may recall, Mr. Chairman, we submitted a petition some time back when the issue of separation came about. When the Marianas District Legislature passed a resolution to separate from the rest of the districts, we then drafted a petition, signed by several members of the UCA, and submitted it to the Committee supporting its political status endorsement. I would like to make it clear that the UCA is in full support of the free association status. I have read the Compact and I think there is more good in that Compact of free association than what I

read so far about the commonwealth status. This is just interpreting the feeling of the members of this Association. I am sorry that Dr. Kaipat is not here as he is the Chairman of our Political Committee and he has more current data to present to the Committee than what we have. Mr. Chairman, we feel that we the UCA should have more political education. A lot of our people are not aware of the disadvantages and the advantages of each alternative --free association, independence, or commonwealth, or incorporated territory. We all decided that we want more political education to be fully aware of all these alternatives, to be able to weigh the advantages and the disadvantages and perhaps come out with some decision as to which road we should take. May I ask a question now?

Chairman Salii: I wonder if we could give Mr. Lifoifoi a chance to say something.

Mr. Lifoifoi: If I may say this, I am representing the Carolinians from the northern part of the island, that is Tanapag Village. We do share the same feeling with the rest of the Carolinians and that is we wholeheartedly support the status defined by your Committee as free association. We would like to ask this Committee to assist the minority group here on the Island should we be forced into another status. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Salii : You have a question, Mr. Fitial, you wanted to raise?

Mr. Fitial: Yes.

Chairman Salii : Before we answer any questions, I would like to ask members of the Committee if they have anything to clarify in regards to the statement made by Mr. Fitial. Senator Amaraich, before we ask questions to Mr. Fitial and the other two gentlemen, I thought it would be appropriate at this time to ask members of the Committee if they have any comments to make in regards to the statements that have been made.

Senator Amaraich: For background information, reference was made to a petition; what was this petition about?

Mr. Fitial: The petition was presented to the Committee.

Mr. Rabauliman: The petition was presented to the Ambassador and members of the United Nations and a copy was sent to the Chairman of this Committee.

Chairman Salii: The petition was directed to Ambassador Kennedy and to the United Nations but we have a copy of the petition in our files.

Senator Amaraich: Was there a general response to that petition either by the United States Government or the United Nations?

Mr. Rabauliman: So far we have not received any response.

Chairman Salii: I will answer for the Committee. There has been no response by the Committee because it was not clear whether the Committee was asked to do something specific on the petition or not. It was directed

MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT

to Ambassador Kennedy. Is this the same document you are referring to?

- Mr. Fitial: We pointed out that the UCA is in full support of what the Joint Committee of the Congress on political status is endorsing.
- Senator Amaraich: That was before the Marianas Political Status Commission was formed. Now, after the formation of that Commission, has the UCA presented its views to the Marianas Commission?
- Mr. Rabauliman: We have not presented any position paper to the Marianas Political Status Commission.
- Senator Amaraich: Is the Association represented in the Commission?
- Mr. Rabauliman: Yes, it has representatives in the Commission.
- Senator Amaraich: You as representative of the Association presented the concern of your Association to the Commission, and if so, what was its reaction?
- Mr. Rabauliman: We have not had any position that the UCA presented to the Commission.
- Mr. Fitial: We still maintain our position that was made to the Ambassador and to the Joint Committee.
- Senator Amaraich: How many members are there in the Association?
- Mr. Rabauliman: All of the Carolinians are members.
- Senator Amaraich: Any idea how many?
- Mr. Rabauliman: 2,700.
- Senator Amaraich: Does that figure include school age?
- Mr. Rabauliman: Only the voting age.
- Senator Amaraich: What exactly are you asking of the Committee when you said "the minority group's interest be protected"?
- Mr. Lifoifoi: We consider ourselves, the Carolinians, as the minority group on this Island and should the decision be made by the majority of the people to accept commonwealth, that which is being negotiated, what would happen then is that we will be forced into a status which we consider may be detrimental to our children. Could the Congress of Micronesia assist us in this way?
- Senator Amaraich: What are you afraid of under the proposed commonwealth?
- Mr. Lifoifoi: Mr. Chairman, from what I know of the present negotiations, this is a one-way deal should we decide for commonwealth. It will close all the doors, and that is what I am afraid of.

Mr. Rabauliman: In addition to what Mr. Joe Lifoifoi mentioned, when the District Legislature passed a resolution for separation from the Trust Territory, that was when we made the petition and we asked that the Congress of Micronesia consider this group with the Joint Committee of the Congress of Micronesia with whatever they decide. That is the concern that we would like to bring to this Committee.

Senator Amaraich: I remember reading somewhere either from a press release, MNS, or a joint communique, where mention was made about ownership of lands, which I assume that under the new government of the Marianas ownership of land will be restricted to people of Marianas ancestry. Mr. Rabauliman, as a member of the Marianas Political Status Commission, do you have any information as to what it means?

Mr. Rabauliman: Yes, those who are originally from the Marianas. That would be my interpretation.

Chairman Salii: Who are originally from the Marianas? Let me see if I understand the question. The question the Senator referred to is in connection with some of the press releases on the Marianas talks...

Senator Amaraich: If I remember correctly, it was part of those things that came out from the Marianas Political Status Commission negotiations. Reference was made to ownership of land under the future government and it was proposed that ownership of land be restricted to people who are of Marianas ancestry. My question is whether there is a definition of that term. What does it mean to the Commission or to the Carolinians, or how would that affect the Carolinians as far as ownership of land is concerned? Are you considered original people of the Marianas?

Senator Pangelinan: May I just interject. I think the interpretation is somewhat broad. The position of the Commission is that those residents of the Marianas, be they Carolinians, Chamorros or otherwise, who legally have ownership of land is the turning point as to where the distinction "Marianas ancestry" lies. Again, the Commission is still trying to make some kind of a clear definition and we take the position that it is anyone who is the legal resident here.

Chairman Salii: Let us say that someone from Yap came here in the past and acquired some property and if he desires to remain, will he hold on to his property?

Senator Pangelinan: I think the definition is "Micronesian". We call it Marianas ancestry because there is no such a thing as a real Chamorro. We call it the "Marianas ancestry" because it means anyone who has legal ownership of land.

Chairman Salii: Does that answer your question, Senator Amaraich?

Senator Amaraich: What I was trying to find out is that the definition has not been made clear.

Senator Pangelinan: Actually the position is that people from the Northern Marianas, since they are qualified, the definition would be a Micronesian who has

legal property in the area.

I have one question. I think all of us agree that in the final analysis, the people will decide what political status they want through a plebiscite. From the statements made here, the gentlemen prefer the free association status. Is this the only kind of alternative you want to see on the ballot? Or, do you welcome independence, commonwealth, or status quo?

Mr. Fitial: We want to see as much as there are available, but like I said, we need to be educated on each and everyone of them. From reading and understanding the free association Compact, it seems that you can't beat this kind of status.

Senator Pangelinan: Because of the fact that the people can have more choice, do you welcome all alternatives be made available?

Mr. Fitial: I would like to see that happen.

Mr. Lifoifoi: I personally decided that I prefer to see only one alternative, and that is free association.

Senator Pangelinan: But, that will be closing the options for any kind of status that a person may choose otherwise.

Mr. Lifoifoi: Yes, that is why I said that I am personally thinking for myself.

Chairman Salii: The Committee will review again the petition which the UCA submitted to Ambassador Kennedy. May I also request that you review it one more time and see if you, in your view, feel it is sufficient to convey the official position of the Association to this Committee or whether you want to make some presentation along that line directly to the Committee, rather than as in the case before, simply informing the Committee with a copy but asking that the question be taken by somebody else. You also mentioned that Dr. Kaipat, who is the president of your Association could not be here this afternoon with you. Please let him know that if there is a communication he wants to convey to the Committee, that he can always do so, and even though the Committee may be away, he can address himself to the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Future Status, Congress of Micronesia, Capitol Hill, Saipan, Mariana Islands. Any further communication not only from the Association but from any other group in the Marianas and in all the districts that want to make any communications they want to make between now and January, that we will be prepared to receive such communications. The Chair has no specific question to raise at this point.

Mr. Fitial: Does the Committee have a timetable set? When does the Committee plan to end negotiating with the United States delegation?

Chairman Salii: We would like to hope and think and prepare ourselves that the next round will be the last negotiating round. The technical aspects of free association require much more technical studies that will have to be completed. We will say this, that we cannot

after the next round come to the Congress and say "this is the complete package". The essentials, etc., which need to be done through studies are more of a technical matter. If within the next ten months we have not been able to reach agreement on the basic issues, my present thinking would be that we should conclude that there will be no reason to hold further rounds. But, to answer your question shortly, there is no timetable.

Mr. Fitial: I was thinking that perhaps the Joint Committee of the Congress should in some form or another go to the districts and conduct similar meetings with the various communities as long as these negotiations continue.

Chairman Salii: That is a good suggestion. We will take it into consideration based on the long pause between 1969 to 1973 where there had been a lack of communication. We feel that the Congress actually represents the thinking of the people, but we will take that suggestion under advisement. I am sorry to put it under those terms. Do you have any specific suggestions you might wish to make to the Committee at this point on the Compact itself?

(None)

Senator Amaraich: I was going to ask to review the Draft Compact and whatever material are available from the Marianas Political Status Commission. They have to tell us why the so-called free association and not commonwealth, but I guess before we can require that, we have to give them an opportunity to review that too.

Chairman Salii: For your information, there is an agreement between members of the Marianas Status Commission and the Joint Committee that if the Commission negotiates commonwealth, that whatever the Congress negotiates should also be presented to the people of this district. We want you to consider this and give us your thoughts.

Mr. Fitial : I am really confused now with the Marianas Political Status Commission because I don't know which status they are negotiating. Perhaps I don't know much.

Chairman Salii: Let me say that the negotiation has not been completed so there is nothing complete to present at this time. They will make their report at the next session of the Marianas District Legislature next month. I would hope that the Association would avail itself of the opportunity to review that part of it. At this point, it will not be too meaningful to give you an answer. We also will review the Compact of free association and it will not be meaningful for the Committee or for anybody to say that "I would say free association", because the Compact is still incomplete, so we limit our evaluation as to what we have thus far. Hopefully, if we can resume the next round and come up with something on the free association, the material will be available in January after we submit it to the Congress of Micronesia. I would also urge that you take a look at all the comments presented to the Congress of Micronesia. Forgetting the label right now, maybe some of you may be turned on or off by the label, look at the proposals and see how you feel about it.