

MINUTE SHEET.

Reference

91/35739

of the islands to which ^(in addition to the islands in the Phoenix group) the US govt asserts claim

we were advised in March that the UK govt was prepared to renounce their title to the six Southern Cook islands

- Cook, Hull, Malden, Starbuck, Vostok (and Fletcher reef which the US govt do not mention), and the

91/82439

conference in NZ. concerned them. The same conference

agreed that the British title to the west island in the

US claim - Christmas should be retained and

that NUKUNONO (which we did not know then that

the US claimed) was a necessary stopping place on

the British trans Pacific service (and of course should

be retained). Christmas is also wanted for

colonization purposes and the NZ govt has urged that

the island and two Penrhyn should under no

circumstances form the subject of discussion with the

US govt.

Arahu + Fakaahu lie N and S ^{respectively} of NUKUNONO and

are part of the same Union group of atolls: Kauahiki

Rakawanga and the Danger is lie between this

group and Penrhyn; Nukunono Fenuafuli Muaketa

and Nukunono are part of the Union group. This

[OVER

p 10 + 1/4
memo of 25
July with
91/35739

group is inhabited and regularly administered by a
Resident Commissioner and
District Officers and local 'Native' government' and
so presumably in such cases any US claims
to title or to grounds of occupation and
administration over a ten year period is based
on US claim based primarily on mere discovery.
The Under groups are administered by NZ through
Native chiefs and our claim is ten years would
in doubt be based on the same grounds. The
islands of Haueliki, Rakahanga + Parbhyn,
and the Darya Is are part of the Cook Is
dependency administered by NZ. They are
all inhabited and administered by Resident
agents under a Resident Commissioner & the
Group. It would seem that the NZ title
to these islands based on occupation and
administration is equally good.

The position therefore seems to be that
we have a good title to all the
islands on the US list and actually
administer them with the exception of
the first few islands - part of the line

quest - our claim is which has been
 rejected. This would seem to indicate the
 basis of our reply - to set out our
 belief that an title is indisputable and
 that we are prepared to defend it at
 arbitration. To set out again our anxiety
 to avoid a long controversy and the
 drawbacks to arbitration. To offer to
 renounce to them our title to the five
 Line Islands (and possibly as a matter
 might our share in Canton and Enderbury
 (if) provided they advance - for all
 an title to all the islands, including
 of course

~~the following islands~~

How to

2/29/8
 23/ VIII
 A. A. A. A.

There does not seem to be much point in my commenting on these papers at this stage, as I am rather out of touch with the most recent decisions of the Committee of Imperial Defence as to what islands are now considered essential and what desirable for both civil and military aviation. We could I imagine leave that aspect for them to consider.

August 29th.

Colville
Air Attache.

[Handwritten initials]

Mr. Mallett
again

We should have presumably
sent the promised further dep.
to the F.O. But I am not
quite sure what time it

should show. (See Sunday's minutes).

AS
[Handwritten initials]

7/11 to 7/10

Vables

Oct 13

12 feet per second

911