

Jäljennös.

K.D.275/77 K.ja T.M.1952.

ULKOASIAINMINISTERIÖ

N:o 38827; K.D.U.M.188/2632 1947.

Helsingissä 15 p:nä lokakuuta 1952.

Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriölle.

Her Britannic Majesty's Legation present their compliments

5.11.52 (577)

Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriö saa täten ~~kehottaa~~ pyytää Suomen
Radiosähköttäjä Liitto r.y:tä -----

N^o 582

tänne toimittamaan lausuntonsa tästä asiasta, jolloin läheteviikko ~~on~~ samalla palautett~~ne~~.

Helsingissä, kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriössä, loka kuun 30 päivänä 1952.



Viran puolesta:

Hallitussihteeri

Tauno Saijonmaa
Tauno Saijonmaa

K. D. 275/77 K. ja T. M. 1952. -19----

Toim:n N:o

6620.

Jäljennös.

K.D.275/77 K. ja T.M.1952.

ULKOASIAINMINISTERIÖ

N:o 38827; K.D.U.M.188/2632 1947.

Helsingissä 15 p:nä lokakuuta 1952.

Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriölle.

Asia: Hallitustenvälinen Neuvoa-
antava Merenkulkujärjestö (IMCO).

Ulkoasiainministeriö lähettää tämän ohella seuraavan asia-
kirjan:

Jäljennös Englannin lähetystön nootista 3 p:ltä lokakuuta,
1952, N:o 98, liitteineen.

Ulkoasiainministeriö pyytää kunnioittavasti Kauppa- ja Teol-
lusministeriötä
antamaan lausuntonsa asiasta.

Ministerin sijasta:

Kansliapäällikkö

P.K. Tarjanne.

Jaostopäällikkö Tauno Sutinen

Liite.

3rd October, 1952.

2239/2/52.

No.98.

NOTE VERBALE

Her Britannic Majesty's Legation present their compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and have the honour to enclose a copy of the Final Act of the United Nations Maritime Conference, which was held at Geneva in the spring of 1948, and drew up the Convention of the Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation (I.M.C.O.) The effect of the Convention will be to establish I.M.C.O. as a specialised agency of the United Nations. This Convention comes in force when twenty-one states have deposited instruments of acceptance with the Secretariat of the United Nations; so far only eleven states have done so. The enclosed list (annex A) shows which countries have already accepted, and which are eligible to accept in the future.

Her Majesty's Government are anxious that the Convention should come into force as soon as possible and are firmly convinced that its establishment will be in the interest of all nations, users of shipping no less than providers of shipping, small nations as well as big. Its constitution as set out in the Convention is carefully designed to give full weight to the varied interests of the nations who become members of the Organisation. Amongst the reasons which have led them to that view are the following:

Safety.

Delay in establishing I.M.C.O. will impede progress on a number of very important measures affecting the safety of life at sea and other technical matters on which broad international understandings have already been reached and which can most effectively be followed up through the machinery of the Maritime Safety Committee under Part VII of the Convention. The 1948 Convention on Safety of Life at Sea comes into operation on 19th November, 1952; it was drafted on the assumption that I.M.C.O. would be established before it took effect, and provides for I.M.C.O. to be the administering body of the 1948 Convention for a number of important purposes. It is, therefore, urgent to obtain sufficient ratifications to bring I.M.C.O. into being.

Apart from the specific questions dealt with in the Safety of Life at Sea Convention, other important matters in the technical field call for a more convenient machinery to handle them if real progress is to be made, e.g. the revision of laws and regulations concerning tonnage measurement, or the question of pollution of the seas by oil (which the Transport and Communications Commission of U.N.O. and the International Law Commission have concluded must be left for consideration by I.M.C.O.)

Government discrimination.

Delay in establishing I.M.C.O. will impede progress in the removal of discriminatory practices. These practices have tended to spread since the war, and they can only be challenged at present at all effectively when they are contrary to the provisions of bilateral commercial treaties, where such treaties exist.

I.M.C.O.'s Part in U.N.O.

Shipping matters, being of international concern, must inevitably be forced on the attention of U.N.O. in one way or another. Already various aspects of shipping law and practice have been the subject of consideration by bodies not fully qualified to deal with the peculiarly technical and economic conditions of shipping business. The establishment of I.M.C.O. should remove this anomaly. More widely, it can be pointed out that, without I.M.C.O., there is a serious gap in the structure of United Nations agencies. In such other important fields as posts, telecommunications and aviation there already exist central inter-governmental organisations. There are many matters of common concern, e.g. co-ordination of safety at sea and in the air, or radio aids to navigation, which require the existence of a similar intergovernmental shipping body so that shipping can be represented in consideration of these problems. To make the United Nations machinery more effective in this field is in the interests of all sections of the life of nations - labour, trade and commerce, agriculture, industry, no less than those engaged in the shipping business itself.

Continuity of Organisations.

In the absence of I.M.C.O. it is necessary to call together sporadic meetings to deal with problems "ad hoc". This is not only an inconvenient procedure, but also inadequate in present-day

circumstances. It is highly desirable, since shipping affairs now come constantly to the attention of Governments, to conduct discussions under the auspices of a single organisation, and thus to establish and maintain contact and continuity of policy between those concerned with international maritime affairs. The existence of a Secretariat will facilitate this continuity. It is, however, contemplated that the Secretariat will be very small and will confine itself to functions consistent with the strictly consultative nature of I.M.C.O. The cost to member nations should therefore be slight (and will, incidentally, involve little or no dollar expenditure in view of Article 44 of the Convention which provides that the headquarters of the Organisation shall be established in London.

Consultative nature of I.M.C.O.

I.M.C.O. is in no sense intended to be a planning body, like O.E.E.C. or the N.A.T.O. Planning Board for Ocean Shipping—the former having a purely temporary function in respect of shipping arising from the United States requirements about the mode of shipment of Economic Aid cargoes, and the latter being restricted to wartime planning. I.M.C.O. is essentially a consultative body, as its title implies. Not only are its functions quite different from those of O.E.E.C. or N.A.T.O., but it will be a fully representative body covering the interests of international shipping throughout the world.

For these reasons and as, moreover, the need to bring the I.M.C.O. into being has been emphasised by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, by the U.N. Transport and Communications Commission and by the U.N. Economic and Social Council, Her Majesty's Government are strongly convinced of the need to bring the I.M.C.O. into operation as rapidly as possible to help shipping to contribute to the welfare, prosperity and security of the world.

Her Majesty's Government therefore urge the Government of Finland, which signed the Convention in 1948, to accept it in the near future.

Her Britannic Majesty's Legation avail themselves of this opportunity to extend to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the assurance of their highest consideration.

ANNEX A.

Countries which have ratified the Convention.

Australia ^{rs}	Canada ^r	Irish Republic ^{rs}	United Kingdom ^{rs}
Belgium ^{rs}	France ^{rs}	Israel	United States of America ^{rs}
Burma	Greece ^{rs}	Netherlands ^{rs}	

Countries now eligible to ratify the Convention.

Afghanistan	Dominican Republic ^r	Jordan	Roumania
Albania	Ecuador ^o	Lebanon ^{rs}	Salvador
Argentina ^{rs}	Egypt ^{rs}	Liberia	Saudi Arabia
Austria	Ethiopia	Luxembourg	Syria
Bolivia	Finland ^{rs}	Mexico	Sweden ^r
Brazil ^r	Guatemala	New Zealand ^r	Switzerland ^{rs}
Bulgaria	Haiti	Nicaragua	Thailand
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Honduras	Norway ^r	Turkey ^{rs}
Chile ^{rs}	Hungary	Pakistan ^r	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
China ^r	Iceland	Panama ^r	Union of South Africa ^o
Colombia ^{rs}	India ^{rs}	Paraguay	U.S.S.R.
Costa Rica	Indonesia	Peru ^r	Uruguay
Cuba ^o	Iran ^o	Philippines	Venezuela
Czechoslovakia ^r	Iraq	Poland ^{rs}	Yemen
Denmark ^r	Italy ^{rs}	Portugal ^{rs}	Jugoslavia

Countries NOT eligible to ratify the Convention (except under Article 8.)

Germany	Japan	Muscat	Nepal	Spain
Ceylon	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	

r - represented by a delegation at the 1948 conference

o - sent only observers to 1948 conference.

s - signed the Convention.