ORIGIN/ACTION		on V	DEPAR	tment of state	e	n. mananes
RM/R	TES	Л - ^р		(G BA	JMP	14780405
-	EUR	PE				FOR RM USE ONLY
NEA	cu		NO.		· / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A-5
·		~		e of searce		HANDLING HOICATON
E/J	PN	₹ õ	Deparemen			
	PBO	AID	DEPARTMENT PLEASE PASS	amembassies tokyo, NBERRA, Wellington,		
01.05	c		VVV FUKUOKA, USUN, ₽C	LAD CINCPAC, CINCPA	CREP GUAM/TTPI,	CCGDFOURTEEN
AGR	COM	FRB	HONOLULU E.O.11652: N/A	Storolulus for	* MAVY	۲ در ک
			FROM Status LNC TAGS : PLOS, TQ), Saipan	DATE: 1	2 September 1977
INT	LAB	TAR		n 200-Mile Fishery	Zone Legislatic	m 👸
TR	хмв	AIR	REF : Status LNC	324		N
ARMY	CIA	NAVY	r-		- Ms Summer	
OSD	USIA	NSA	PASS INTERIOR FOR ON	SN/DOTA —	3 mil was	
			There is enclosed (e 29 by the Congress of to come into force J by the High Commissi writing he has not y the main provisions The bill as original COM in February and of the Interior. It Committee, acting on Delegation. The ret objectionable to the species and claiming foreign governments. Enclosure 2.	Micronesia, estab uly 1, 1979. The b oner within 30 days of officially recei- of the bill. ly introduced was i vetoed by the High was then extensive the advice of the rision sought to eli USG, notably those sauthority to negot The house committ	olishing a 200-m bill will become s of receipt; at wed the bill. dentical to one Commissioner an ely revised by t Micronesian Law minate the prove purporting to tiate fishery ag the report is at	tile fishery zone law unless vetoed the date of Reftel summarizes passed by the d the Secretary he House Judiciary of the Sea risions most regulate migratory reements with tached as
τ ₍	ل / ب / ل	IH / \/	² As passed by the Hou potentially objection nology: the use of m Micronesia" having of More importantly, th a right for the COM into by the United S for the High Commiss	mable provisions. words such as "marin connetations broaden we bill contained a to veto internation wates. It also fai	Some of these 1 ne space jurisdi than the regul provision (sect al fishery agre- led to provide	nvolved termi- ction" or "sea of ation of fisheries. ion 153) claiming ements entered any right of review
			L		$\overline{}$	L
			FORM 4 - 62 DS- 323			FOR DEPT. USE ONLY
				L'outents as	A Classification Approved	
Drafted	by:	Ś	SLNO:PJBennett/lc	the p	aul J., Bennett	By:

UNCLASSIFIED

Maritime Authority (MMA), although veto power over such regulations was reserved for the COM. By a letter to the House and Senate committees, (enclosure 3), I pointed out these unsatisfactory aspects of the bill.

Discussions with the LOS Delegation and the COM staff followed, in which the Delegation (particularly its chairman, Charles Domnick, and vicechairman, Sen. Nick Bossy, and its counsel, Fred Ramp) played a constructive and helpful part. As a result of these discussions, substantially all the revisions I had suggested were incorporated into the Senate version of the bill (see Senate committee report, enclosure 4), which the House then accepted.

We failed to reach agreement on only one point, that of the High Commissioner's right of review. This was conceded with respect to the allocation among foreign nations of the total allowable level of foreign fishing (section 152(4)), but not with respect to MMA regulations and other actions. Instead, the bill was revised so that the MMA is to consist of four members appointed by the High Commissioner, four appointed by the COM presiding officers, and one, holding a casting vote, appointed jointly by the High Commissioner and the presiding officers. While it is clear that the High Commissioner must seek in good faith to reach agreement on the identity of a ninth member, if he is unable to do so the MMA will be left with only eight members, and the agreement of at least one of the High Commissioner's appointees will be necessary for it to act.

Even if the ninth member opposes a USG position, a regulation or action by the MMA which contravenes applicable U.S. legislation or treaties, or international law, could be invalidated by a declaratory judgment of the TTPI High Court, applied for by the Attorney General. In addition, exclusive jurisdiction over cases arising under the bill is vested by its terms (section 207) in the High Court. Justices of the High Court are appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and at present all of them are U.S. citizens.

The authority to promulgate regulations has previously been vested in numerous TTPI management and regulatory bodies, without any right of veto being reserved to the High Commissioner. While the responsibilities of most of these bodies are domestic in nature, some such as district foreign investment boards, have authority over decisions of importance to foreign nationals. There has been no suggestion that such authority, or that over the existing 12-mile exclusive fishing zone, has been exercised in an illegal manner. USG insistence on retaining a U.S. veto over MMA regulations would thus seem inconsistent with the U.S. responsibility under the Trusteeship Agreement to "promote the development of the inhabitants . . . toward self-government or inde-

UNCLASSIFIED

8

UNCLASSIFIED

pendence . . . give to the inhabitants. . . a progressively increasing share in the administrative services in the territory . . . develop their participation in government". It will also be recalled that neither my instructions concerning the bill which was passed in February (State 29946 NOTAL) nor the veto messages of the High Commissioner and Secretary intimated that the U.S. required a right of review of regulations.

Accordingly, I believe that the bill as passed adequately safeguards the U.S. legal position and U.S. foreign affairs responsibilities, and I strongly recommend that the USG not direct a veto.

The High Commissioner concurs in the foregoing analysis.

BENNETT

Enclosures: 1)House Bill # 7-287 29 August 1977 2)House Committee Report 3)Ltr to House and Senate committees 4)Senate report

UNCLASSIFIED