

5. Although Canada had not expressed any formal interest in the draft trusteeship agreement for the former Japanese mandated islands prior to the issuance of invitations, it was felt that Canada should accept the invitation to participate in the Security Council's discussion of the agreement in view of two direct Canadian interests in these islands:

- A. A security interest in the United States remaining in effective control of these islands. These islands occupy a strategic position in the West central Pacific that might once more serve as a spring board for an attack on the North American continent if they are not held securely by the United States. They would also play an important logistical role in any future war in which Canadian forces might be sent to fight on the mainland of Asia.
- B. Any Canadian trans-Pacific air route, which did not run via the Aleutian Islands or down to Southern Australia, would have to pass through these islands en route to such southeast Asia capitals as Manila, Hongkong, Saigon, Bangkok, Singapore or Batavia.

6. Accordingly a Canadian representative was appointed to attend subsequent discussions of the Security Council on the Trusteeship Agreement. On March 28, the Canadian representative submitted a statement of Canadian views and interests to the Security Council on the issue. In his statement, Mr. Ignatieff, the Canadian Representative, indicated that while his Government was happy to approve the United States Trusteeship Agreement, it wished to express the hope that as the system of Trusteeship Agreements developed, and possibly if provisions were made in the present Agreement, wider provision would be made for international supervision under the trusteeship clauses of the Charter. The full text of this statement is attached in Annex. IV.

7. The question of the appropriateness of the Security Council approving the Trusteeship Agreement prior to the Japanese peace treaty was the principal subject of debate during the discussions. The United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and others entertained serious doubts as to the legal validity of any agreement completed before the conclusion of a Peace Treaty with Japan, in which Japan renounced any rights in the islands which she might still consider herself to possess either as one of the principal Allied or Associated Powers of the First World War to whom Germany renounced the islands or as exercising on behalf of the League of Nations a mandate in terms defined by the Council of the League of Nations. These objections, however, were not pressed in view of the large measure of approval which was accorded to the Agreement by members of the Security Council and by those members of the Far Eastern Commission who were not members of the Security Council but who were allowed to participate in the discussions. The unanimous feeling of the Security Council was in favour of the United States as administering authority and that