

time specify certain areas as closed for security reasons. The Council was assured that the United States would faithfully support the principle of effective supervision by the United Nations within the limits imposed by its obligation to administer that area in such a way as to preserve the security of the United States and to strengthen collective security under the United Nations. The United States representative concluded by stating that it was the profound belief of the Government of the United States and of the American people that the administration of those islands by the United States in accordance with the terms of the draft Agreement would contribute both to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the well-being and advancement of the inhabitants of the islands.

The representative of the U.S.S.R. considered that the question of the former Japanese mandated islands was within the competence of the Security Council, that the Council was empowered to take a decision upon it and that it was not required to observe any delay in such a decision. He stated that it was the opinion of the Soviet delegation that it would be right and proper to place the area of the former Japanese mandated islands under the trusteeship of the United States, as the Soviet Government considered that the United States forces played a decisive role in the victory over Japan.

The discussion of the matter was continued at the 116th meeting of the Council on March 7, 1947. At that meeting the representative of the United Kingdom stated that while his Government was entirely agreeable in principle to the United States Government's ultimately becoming the Administering Authority in respect of the mandated area, his Government had doubts, on a strictly legal basis, as to the propriety of the Security Council considering the draft Trusteeship Agreement for the mandated islands pending final disposal of the islands under the peace treaty with Japan. He continued that if, however, the majority of the members of the Council wished to proceed in the sense requested by the United States representative, he would not oppose the adoption of such a course.

The Australian representative stated that the decision made by the Security Council should be finally confirmed at the Peace Conference settling the Pacific war, and that States not members of the Security Council

who were belligerents in that war should have an opportunity to discuss the terms of trusteeship.

At the 118th meeting of the Council on March 12, it was agreed to extend an invitation to the Governments of India and New Zealand, as well as to those members of the Far Eastern Commission¹ not already represented on the Security Council, to participate in the discussions of the United States Draft Trusteeship Agreement.

At the same meeting, the representative of Australia proposed to add a new article as Article 17) which read as follows:

This Agreement is subject to confirmation in the interim or final treaty of peace between Japan and the Allied Powers, victorious in the war against Japan, it being understood that by such treaty Japan shall be required to surrender all its rights, if any, relating to the control and administration of the present territories, and such territories shall be formally detached from any form of control by Japan.

At the meeting of the Security Council on March 17, representatives of Canada, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the Philippines—as Governments interested in the discussion of the draft Agreement—took their places at the Council table.

At that meeting, the President of the Council—the representative of Brazil—gave his opinion on the constitutional aspects of the Australian amendment. He thought it difficult to accept the idea that a decision by the Council on matters relating to trusteeship for strategic areas should require confirmation by any other international body, whether linked with the United Nations or not. It was his opinion that if the Council approved the Trusteeship Agreement, that decision was final so far as

¹ The Far Eastern Commission, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., was established by the Council of Foreign Ministers at Moscow on December 16 to 26, 1946, to replace the Far Eastern Advisory Commission (established in October 1945), but to be composed of the same members: Australia, Canada, China, France, Great Britain, India, Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, the U.S.S.R. and the United States. The functions of the Commission, limited, inter alia, with regard to the conduct of military operations and territorial changes, are to formulate policies for the carrying out of the terms of the Japanese surrender, to review directives within its jurisdiction to and from the Supreme Commander of Japan, and to discuss such other matters as may be proposed by a majority of its members with China, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and the United States concurring.