

European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1974-1975

25 October 1974

DOCUMENT 305/74

Report

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport

on ~~land~~/sea transport problems in the Community

Rapporteur: Mr Horst SEEFELD

PE 37.149/fin.

By letter of 18 June 1968 the President of the European Parliament authorized the Transport Committee to submit a report on sea transport questions in the Community. The committee appointed Mr Seefeld rapporteur on 26 June 1972.

The Committee on Regional Policy and Transport, newly constituted on 13 March 1973, discussed the draft report at its meetings of 11 September 1973 and 2 October 1974.

At its meeting of 2 October 1974 it adopted the motion for a resolution and explanatory statement unanimously with one abstention.

The following were present: Mr James Hill, chairman; Mr Seefeld, vice-chairman and rapporteur; Mr Brugger (deputizing for Mr Mitterdorfer), Mr Delmotte, Mr Fabbrini, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Krall (deputizing for Mr Bourdellès), Mr Liogier, Lord Mansfield, Mr Mursch, Mr Noè (deputizing for Mr Colin), Mr Nyborg and Mr Scholten.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	5
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	9
Introduction	9
I. The role of sea transport in the Community's external trade.	13
(a) International organizations	13
(b) Trade agreements	14
(c) New maritime nations	16
(d) Flag discrimination	17
(e) 'Cheap flags'	18
(f) Code of conduct for line conferences	19
II. The role of sea transport in intra-Community trade	21
(a) Reservation on cabotage	22
(b) Competition	23
(c) Tariff policy	24
(d) Hinterland transport	25
III. The importance of a sea transport policy for ports and shipbuilding	26
(a) Ports	26
(b) Port investments	26
(c) Shipbuilding	27
IV. The harmonization of Member States' legislation on sea transport	28
(a) Social legislation	29
(b) Taxes and subsidies	30
(c) Approximation of commercial law	30
(d) Technical regulations	33
(e) The prevention of marine pollution	33
(f) Controls	35
(g) Statistics	36
Summary	36

The Committee on Regional Policy and Transport hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement :

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on sea transport problems in the Community

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the report of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport (Doc. 305/74);
 - having regard to the fact that with the enlargement of the Community a coherent transport policy cannot be developed without taking sea transport into account;
 - in view of the great importance of sea transport for the Community's trade and in particular its relations with third countries;
1. Expresses its growing concern at the lack of Community rules on sea transport and of a common approach to questions of international maritime policy;
 2. Reiterates the request already submitted to the Council on several occasions that in partial application of Article 84(2) of the EEC Treaty the Commission should be instructed to submit proposals for a common sea transport policy without restricting its scope for submitting proposals under other provisions of the Treaty, for example Article 116;
 3. Calls on the Commission to submit proposals in the following areas and in accordance with the following principles:
 - I. The role of the sea transport policy in the Community's external trade:
 - (a) The Member States of the Community should be jointly represented as soon as and to the widest extent possible in international organizations and at international conferences concerned with sea transport questions;
 - (b) Shipping clauses in trade and shipping agreements concluded by the Community with third countries must be aligned with a common sea transport policy;
 - (c) The Community must evolve and adopt, particularly in UNCTAD, a common position as regards countries wanting to build up their own merchant fleets;

- (d) The Community must develop a common programme of action against flag discrimination;
- (e) It would appear that joint action is urgently necessary in order to bring the problem of 'cheap flags' nearer to solution, priority being given to clarification of the term 'cheap flags'. The methods applied should include tax harmonization, upward harmonization of social regulations and harmonization of safety and insurance regulations;
- (f) The Commission should urge the Member States to adopt a common position on the code of conduct for line conferences established by the UN.

II. The role of sea transport within the Community:

- (a) The reservation on cabotage in coastal shipping between Member States and between the latter and their overseas territories should be abolished. Measures should be introduced to harmonize factors having the greatest cost implications, which at present distort competition;
- (b) Measures taken by the Community must help to ensure that in competition between the shipping companies in the Member States and in competition between coastal shipping and land and air transport, the means of transport which is most favourable on the basis of overall economic criteria is chosen in each instance;
- (c) The Commission should establish how far the operation of the Common Market requires certain tariff rules covering non-discrimination and publication of tariffs in sea transport;
- (d) The common sea transport policy should make due allowance for port hinterland traffic and its geo-economic implications.

III. The importance of a sea transport policy for ports and shipbuilding:

- (a) The common sea transport policy must take a form compatible with a common policy on ports, which the European Parliament has also called for;
- (b) The common sea transport policy must help to solve the problem raised by the increasingly heavy demands which progress in transport techniques (giant tankers, container shipping) places on port investments. In this connection the Community should make a contribution to technical progress (nuclear propulsion, landing platforms etc.);

- (c) The common policy on shipbuilding and shipbuilding subsidies must be coordinated with the common sea transport policy.

IV. The harmonization of Member States' sea transport legislation:

- (a) There should be upward harmonization of the working conditions of seamen and other employees in the sea transport sector. Special account should be taken of the regulations on crew strengths, training, mutual recognition of qualifications, freedom of movement, overtime, leave and insurance cover. There must, however, be no restriction on the freedom of action of the social partners in fixing rates of pay;
 - (b) Member States' tax regulations covering sea transport operations, including concessions in respect of depreciation, must be harmonized; the same applies to indirect and direct subsidies;
 - (c) The Commission should consider which provisions of the Member States' commercial law must be harmonized;
 - (d) Of the technical regulations the following must in particular be harmonized: safety regulations and regulations on construction, fitting-out, capacity gauging and registration in cases where general standards do not already exist under international conventions;
 - (e) The Community should support, by joint action, international efforts to prevent pollution of the seas;
 - (f) Appropriate standard control measures must be taken to ensure uniform implementation of all harmonization measures;
 - (g) The Commission, assisted by its Statistical Office, should encourage the further harmonization of sea transport statistics.
4. Requests that, in working out the Community's sea transport policy and the harmonization of the legislation of the Member States, account should be taken as far as possible of international agreements concluded within the framework of existing organizations and of the situation that can arise in worldwide competition;
5. Instructs its Committee on External Economic Relations to take special account of sea transport questions in its report on commercial agreements between the Community and third countries and if necessary, to obtain an opinion from the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport;
6. Calls on the Commission to submit as soon as possible the proposals for a common sea transport policy announced in its communication to the Council of 24 October 1973 on the development of the Common Transport Policy (Doc. 226/73);

7. Requests the Commission to submit proposals for a common position on the planned continuation of the Caracas Conference on the Law of the Sea, since this concerns important aspects of the sea transport policy;
8. Instructs its President to forward this resolution and the report of its committee to the Council and Commission of the European Communities.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTIntroduction

1. The Treaty establishing the European Economic Community excludes sea and air transport from the common transport policy. Article 84(1) states: 'The provisions of this Title (i.e. Title IV, 'Transport', of Part Two, 'Foundations of the Community') shall apply to transport by rail, road and inland waterway.'

Article 84(2), however, adds: 'The Council may, acting unanimously, decide whether, to what extent and by what procedure appropriate provisions may be laid down for sea and air transport.'

2. The European Parliament has in various reports expressed the view that under Article 84(2) sea transport is not governed by the Title on Transport but is subject to the general provisions of the Treaty. This interpretation, namely that the general rules of the Treaty also apply to sea transport even if the Council has not adopted any measures under Article 84(2), was upheld by the Court of Justice in its judgment of 4 April 1974 in case 167/73 (Commission of the European Communities v. the French Republic). In partial anticipation of its recognition of this legal situation, the Council of Ministers already had to make it clear in Regulation No. 141 of 26 November 1962 (OJ No. 124 of 28 November 1962) that sea transport was excluded from the application of Council Regulation No. 17 implementing the competition rules contained in Articles 85ff. of the Treaty. Since that time there has been little change in the situation. Parliament has on various occasions called for the extension of Article 84(2) to include air and sea transport in the Community's terms of reference, but the Council has not made any move in this direction.

3. There is no point in asking why the authors of the Treaty left sea transport out of the Common transport policy during the negotiations at Val Duchesse in 1957, i.e. 17 years ago. It may be that they simply could not agree on rules for sea transport or that they intended to draw up special rules for sea transport but did not have the time before the Treaty was pronounced ready for signature by the Heads of Government, or they had specific reasons for excluding sea transport which are unknown to us. In any case the situation is now completely different, and the urgent appeal of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport for the Commission to be given a mandate to draft proposals for a common sea transport policy is based on an appraisal of the present situation and future developments in this field.

4. There have been many changes since 1957: the Community has been enlarged by three countries that are particularly important in world shipping. The Community has established the beginnings of a common external economic policy, but this cannot work if it overlooks one of the most important instruments of Europe's external trade, namely sea transport. Sooner than it would like, the Community is being forced by world economic developments and by its overseas partners to speak with one voice and to adopt a common position. In all major questions of world economic policy sea transport has again and again played an important role for the Community. Whether it is a question of establishing normal commercial relations, of granting development or food aid or of facing crises such as have occurred in the energy supply and international monetary sectors, sea transport always plays a significant part and is always affected to a considerable degree.

The importance of sea transport for movement within the Community has also changed: while the frontiers between the Member States of the Community of the Six were mainly land frontiers and the share of sea transport in intra-Community transport was probably (precise figures are not available) below 5%, 'sea frontiers' are now far more important, there being no land connection between two Member States and the rest of the Community. The Commission estimates the proportion of sea transport in the internal trade of the Nine at 25%.

5. Your committee therefore feels that the time has now come for the Council to give the Commission a mandate in partial application of Article 84(2) of the EEC Treaty to draw up proposals for initial steps towards a common sea transport policy. The list of required measures given in this report should be impressive enough to justify this demand. The mandate to work out a coherent sea transport policy should, of course, not curtail the Commission's scope for putting forward individual proposals, for example on the basis of Article 116.

6. In this introduction your committee wishes to state its strong and unequivocal opposition to a number of arguments frequently advanced by those who are against the inclusion of sea transport in the European Community's terms of reference.

7. Sea transport, it is argued, should not be included in the Common Transport Policy because it is governed by 'special conditions' and cannot be made subject to the same rules as other means of transport.

Needless to say, this report does not call for the same conditions. The principles governing inland transport quite clearly cannot be applied to sea transport as they stand. No one is suggesting that locomotives should be used to pull sea-going vessels. What is needed is a dynamic concept for a common sea transport policy which allows for world-wide contingencies and

developments and the specific conditions governing sea transport. But it is equally clear that certain basic principles of the common economic policy of the European Community must also be applied to sea transport. The generally free-market basic structure of the Community, the principle of non-discrimination and a number of other fundamental principles must surely also be applied to sea transport. There can be no progress in the discussion on this subject if some demand that different and others that the same principles be applied as to the other means of transport without saying what these principles are: basic principles such as market economy, competition, equal treatment, and non-discrimination or 'second-line principles' like those laid down in Articles 74 to 82 of the EEC Treaty.

8. Another frequently heard argument is that since sea transport is subject to world-wide ramifications and world-wide rules, it should not be forced into the 'narrow confines' of Community regulations, which would only represent a step backwards compared with world-wide arrangements.

There is no logic to this argument, popular though it may be. What European industry is not subject to world-wide ramifications? Is it not simply true to say of the European economy, with its dependence on imports of raw materials and its vital need to export, that everything we do has world-wide ramifications? Even the cereals which grow in our fields are subject to world-wide rules which in ~~some~~ respects go further than world arrangements for sea transport.

The reason why the 'world-wide ramifications' argument has found so many adherents in transport policy is perhaps that at least one major mode of transport - rail transport - does not have such ramifications. However, the railways, with their regional monopolies, are a major exception among all other sectors of the economy. The ramifications of the other modes of transport (road transport, inland waterways, pipelines) are also continental rather than world-wide; however, it is only in relation to these and not to industry and agriculture that the world-wide ramifications of sea transport are unusual.

In addition, it is perfectly clear that any Community regulations (on cereals or sea transport) must take account of existing international agreements and either conform to them or, if they are seen to be inadequate, attempt to supplement or correct them.

The world-wide ramifications of sea transport cannot be used as an argument against the application of Article 84(2). The Community is no longer a free trade area without a developing common external economic policy. In view of the world-wide ramifications of the Community's economy as a whole it is essential for sea transport to be included in the Community's external economic policy.

9. A further argument, usually muted, is that sea transport policy is better left in the hands of the maritime nations and city-ports, of economic circles close to shipping and possessing the necessary expertise than in the hands of bureaucrats in Brussels. This argument has, however, grown weaker of late since it has become clear that faced with the strong pressure of flag discrimination and 'cheap flags' the argument of 'unity is strength' carries greater weight than the quiet satisfaction of the lone furrow. A certain measure of bureaucracy will always be unavoidable if there is to be cooperation; the negligible cost of a bureaucracy of this kind may, however, be well worthwhile if it results in a common approach by the Member States.

10. The final argument, likewise seldom expressed in as many words, is the 'national' one: for reasons of tradition people (even those who live far inland) associate sea transport with the national flag, perhaps because mottoes such as 'world prestige' and 'trade follows the flag' were once paraded as an incentive to sacrifice for sea transport (tax concessions etc.). The same argument is now used to prevent the incorporation of sea transport in the Community's external economic policy. Such arguments are rightly no longer advanced publicly since they, too, lack all logic: if true, they would mean that sea transport serves the national interest more than other branches of the economy, but cannot serve the interests of the Community. In this report the attempt is made to advocate a more sensible attitude.

11. Finally, as regards defence policy considerations, which are likewise put forward as a reason for not including sea transport in the Community's terms of reference, suffice it to say that they can easily be catered for in the common sea transport policy. The resulting problems should be no more serious than is the case with policy on petroleum or cereals and should in any case strengthen the argument for introducing Community regulations.

12. As has happened so often in the history of the Community it is pressure from outside which is forcing Europe to act. Your committee has the impression that the proposal for action in this field at this precise point in time is not unrealistic because the opposite forces at play are being thrust into the background by the grave threat to sea transport in the Community posed by international monetary chaos, flag discrimination and the spreading damage down by 'cheap flags'.

13. The circles directly concerned have anticipated Community action by setting up an instrument of cooperation at the level of the Nine in the form of a Committee of the Associations of Shipowners in the European Communities (CAACE), with its head office in Brussels while the seamen's trade unions have long been cooperating at the level of the Six and Nine through the European offices of the Transport Workers' Unions, ITF, WVA and CGT/CGIL in Brussels.

14. The resistance to European regulations would consequently seem to stem less from those concerned than from certain administrative circles (which further weakens the argument against bureaucrats in Brussels).

15. Decision-making on sea transport policy at European Community level has become an unavoidable issue. The Community as such will be jointly responsible in the question of whether the 'mare liberum' principle will continue to apply in future or whether a more orderly sea transport market will be achieved.

I. The role of sea transport in the Community's external trade

16. A common policy in those areas of the sea transport policy which affect the Community's external trade, namely shipping clauses in trade agreements, development policy, flag discrimination and re-registration of vessels is an urgent need, far more important at present than the inclusion of sea transport in a policy governing intra-Community transport.

17. Sea transport has not hitherto played its rightful part in the Community's external economic policy.

18. The role of sea transport in the external economic policy must therefore be dealt with separately, as in the present report, which first discusses it before going into questions of intra-Community transport, thereby reflecting the special importance your committee wishes to give the matter.

(a) International organizations

19. As in other areas of the external economic policy, the Member States of the Community should adopt as soon and as far as possible, a common position on questions of sea transport policy.

20. The most important negotiations on questions of world sea transport are at present being held within the framework of the United Nations. Shipping questions have proved to be of great significance for development policy, which is why UNCTAD, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, has devoted more attention to sea transport questions than might have been expected. (For information on the United Nations agreement of April 1974 on the introduction of a code of conduct for sea transport problems see below Section I(f), paragraphs 51-53). Sea transport policy problems (territorial waters, prevention of pollution of the sea) were also broached at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in Caracas, which is shortly to be continued.

21. IMCO, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, with its head office in London, has 77 member states (1973) and holds general consultative assemblies every two years and in addition numerous special meetings to discuss various legal and technical questions related to sea transport.

22. The International Labour Organization and its International Labour Office in Geneva have achieved progress in various social matters for sea-going personnel.

23. Where special questions are concerned, e.g. dangerous goods, considerable importance attaches to ICHCA, the International Cargo-Handling Coordination Association (London).

24. GATT, too, contains transport provisions, and during the GATT negotiations sea transport questions are repeatedly broached although the Member States have not yet agreed on a common position on transport policy.

25. At European level the United Nations' Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) in Geneva deals with major shipping issues such as the simplification of customs clearance and other formalities in respect of sea-going vessels.

26. Annual reports on sea transport questions are published by OECD in Paris, which has been devoting attention - without any striking success - to flag discrimination and other shipping questions (sharing the work with the Conférence Européenne des Ministres des Transports (CEMT), which itself is not active in the field of shipping).

27. The above list of bodies and organisations in itself reveals that there is very little coordination of maritime policy at world level. Cooperation between the Community countries, which at present account for about one-quarter of world transport, might not only be of great benefit to them but also help to improve the situation in the world as a whole.

28. Your committee at any rate feels that the Community should henceforth adopt a common position and speak with one voice in all these organizations.

(b) Trade agreements

29. As sea transport is the most important technical instrument in external trade, all the classic trade agreements from the earliest days have contained shipping clauses. In most cases they are even known as 'trade and shipping agreements'.

30. At present such agreements are in some cases negotiated jointly on the basis of Article 113 of the EEC Treaty,¹ while in other cases existing

¹ Council decision of 16 December 1969 on the progressive standardization of agreements concerning commercial relations between Member States and third countries and on the negotiation of Community agreements (OJ No. L 326, 29 December 1969).

agreements are tacitly extended.¹ The Commission is given a mandate covering shipping clauses by the Council every time it negotiates a new agreement, which is tantamount to partial application of Article 84(2). Although the Community's and Member States' transport authorities are involved, their negotiating position is rather weak since they do not have the backing of a common sea transport policy concept.

31. Your committee calls for greater account to be taken of the Community's shipping interests during negotiations on trade agreements. Article 113 is not adequate in this respect.

32. The results so far achieved by the Community with trade agreements are correspondingly weak. Argentina merely agreed on 8 November 1973 to a unilateral declaration of intent on sea transport, which came to nothing. Under the trade agreement concluded with Uruguay on 2 April 1973 letters have been exchanged on sea transport. The contents of the letters of the two parties do not, however, agree in important respects. An exchange of letters dated 19 December 1973 between the EEC and Brazil with the same wording was weakened by a Brazilian memorandum which goes no further than describing the status quo.

33. The European shipowners' organization CAACE¹ makes the following complaint in its annual report for 1973:

'Repeated attempts were made during the year to have non-discrimination clauses included in the trade agreements being negotiated by the Commission with Uruguay, Brazil and India. Internal differences of opinion on the legal interpretation and implications of Article 84(2) of the Treaty of Rome prevented, however, any mention of shipping in the final text of the agreements.'

34. While even in the normal course of events it must be feared that the goods to be shipped will almost always be regarded as more important than the interests of those shipping them, the Community transport policy makers are thwarted by Article 84(2) and disputes within the Council of Ministers even before the negotiations begin.

¹ The last decision authorizing the tacit extension or continued operation of certain Treaties of Friendship, Trade and Navigation Treaties and similar Agreements concluded by the Member States with third countries is dated 6 December 1973 (OJ No. L 30 of 4 February 1974).

² CAACE - Comité des Associations d'Armateurs des Communautés Européennes: "Annual Report 1973", page 7.

35. Even in relations with the USA it has not as yet been possible to achieve normal conditions for sea transport. The so-called DISC tax provisions contain a discriminating element, which is a cause of complaint among European shipowners, and the same applies to the Oil Import Preference Bills and the methods of applying the US provisions on coastal shipping to the transport of containers between US ports by European vessels.

36. The Community has so far completely ignored the state trading countries, which in default of a clear-cut Community position on maritime policy, are able to insist that all their export transactions are effected on a cif basis and all their import transactions on an fob basis, which leaves sea transport completely in their hands and simply eliminates European shipowners from this trade.

(c) New maritime nations

37. The traditional maritime nations, among them a number of the Member States of the Community, are faced with the difficult task of adopting a new and reasonable attitude towards the efforts of some countries, which hitherto have not been involved to any large extent in sea transport, to build up their own fleets.

38. The first, and understandable, reaction was to try and make it clear to these countries that the traditional maritime nations were able to provide sea transport at far lower costs, that new fleets of this kind would simply create excess capacity on the world market, that in terms of costs the developing nations would not be competitive, that subsidies would have to be paid out of their budgets, etc. The question was also whether there was any point in granting development aid if it were to be used to build up fleets which would compete with those of the countries granting the aid; the latter would thus be asked to make a two-fold sacrifice, and, the final result would be not an improvement but an increase in the cost of sea transport throughout the world.

39. The developing countries, however, argue that there is no point in European industrialized nations helping the developing countries to build up their economies if afterwards they are not to be allowed to compete or only allowed to compete in fields in which the industrialized nations are not active, i.e. apparently the production of tropical raw materials. The developing countries at present supply 60% of the world's commodities, while their share in the transport of these goods is well below 10%.

40. It is obviously in the interests of the Community to advocate the retention of as much freedom as possible in world shipping. It is just as certain, however, that the countries previously involved to a lesser extent in sea transport cannot be denied access to world sea transport by references to principles of non-discrimination. Some aspects of this question are being discussed in UNCTAD, and Section 1(f) of this report goes into greater detail on the Code of Conduct for Line Conferences which was signed in April of this year.

41. Your committee does not want to prejudge detailed examinations and the Commission's proposals, but it should be pointed out that the Community must seek as a matter of urgency a joint position which takes account of the interests of all concerned by neither turning development policy into a farce nor sacrificing the interests of the European sea transport industry on the altar of development aid.

(d) Flag discrimination

42. Even if the problem of the new maritime nations is solved, the Members States' shipping industries will still be constantly confronted with the pressure of a growing wave of measures that constitute discrimination against European flags in competition for sea transport business.

43. It is becoming increasingly evident that the Member States individually have no defence against this mounting pressure. There can be no hope of a turnaround in the world trend unless the Community adopts a common position. Consequently, the Commission should initially concentrate on proposals relating to this problem. It could help to standardize Member States' legislation on the prevention of flag protectionism and ensure coordinated enforcement of such legislation.

44. However, Community instruments must also be created. On the one hand, all trade agreements concluded by the Community should contain non-discrimination clauses for sea transport; on the other hand, consideration could be given to whether common retaliatory provisions - based on Article 84(2) - could be drawn up and enforced by the Community. These could be modeled on the Community's anti-dumping measures. Although there would be no necessity to apply all the retaliatory measures in every instance, the mere existence of such Community instruments would deter the Community's partners from issuing discriminatory regulations. It has been suggested that the Community instruments might, for example, require authorization for the loading and unloading of vessels from flag-discriminating countries etc.

Such measures might obviously make world trade extremely bureaucratic; they could also provoke countermeasures and should therefore be considered only as a last means of defence.

45. Whatever methods the Community may apply, it is evident that common action is urgently needed to keep world shipping relatively free.

(e) 'Cheap flags'

46. While the problem of flag discrimination is making life difficult for the shipping companies of the Community countries by simply excluding them from certain branches of trade, 'sheep flags' represent a double threat to the healthy development of shipping in the Community:

- on the one hand, shipping companies sailing under 'cheap flags' can offer lower prices than others because their costs are lower for many different reasons;
- on the other hand, 'cheap flags' represent a constant temptation to the shipping capital of the Member States to likewise seek the (doubtful) benefit of cost advantages by re-registering their vessels.

47. The costs advantages of 'cheap flags' stem from lower taxes and lax crewing requirements, safety and other technical regulations. Although extremely modern giant tankers sail under the 'cheap flags' of Panama, Honduras, Liberia, Columbia and other countries, their fleets also include real cockle-shells which will now only produce a profit if they go down and their owners can collect the insurance money. Although some of these countries have legislation, its enforcement is not taken seriously. The Community could take action against this situation firstly by harmonizing the regulations of the Community countries (taking account of existing agreements at world level) and then applying a common procedure for the control of ships calling at Community ports. Sub-standard vessels might be blacklisted and banned from entering Community ports or charged certain fees.

48. A solution to the problem of re-registration is much harder to find. Although the measures discussed in paragraph 47 above could be expected to make re-registration less attractive than today, this is an extremely remote hope and what is more, it does not touch on the problem of tax which is still one of the most important reasons for re-registration, even if other factors (labour costs) have recently gained in importance.

49. The Community instrument in this case might consist in common tax concessions for sea transport. A common approach by the Community Member States or activity by the Community as such could, however, considerably increase the range of possible methods since the scope for enforcement would be greater.

50. Your committee regards the fight against 'cheap flags' as a Community task which must be tackled without delay.

(f) Code of Conduct for Line Conferences

51. The most important regulating instrument created by the shipping companies to govern world line transport is the sea transport conference. Such conferences lay down for their members, in respect of certain transport regions and lines, binding provisions on freight rates, conditions of carriage and other details of sea transport. Since these conferences cannot be completely controlled by any single state they are in a position to exercise considerable power.

In its work on the importance of sea transport in external trade, particularly the external trade of the developing countries, UNCTAD very soon realized that the key to the solution of a number of important shipping questions lay with these conferences rather than with individual states.

At a Conference called by UNCTAD, therefore, a 'code of conduct' was worked out for line conferences. This took the form of a convention with an annex and three attached resolutions and was signed on 6 April 1974 in Geneva. The convention will be available for signature at the United Nations headquarters until 30 June 1975 but accession will still be possible even after that date. It will come into force when at least 24 states with a minimum of 25% of the world trade tonnage have signed. There is no doubt that the convention will come into effect in the not too distant future even without the cooperation of the nine Member States of the European Communities.

The most important points of this 'code of conduct' are as follows:

- The shipping companies of a country which is served by a conference have an inalienable right to membership in that conference.
- Of the transport operations between two countries the shipping companies of those two countries are to have shares of about 40% each, third countries receiving the remaining 20%.
- Provision is made for consultations and arbitration proceedings between shipping companies and shippers in which government representatives shall participate.
- The fixing of freight rates is to be based on certain criteria. Set periods are to be observed in the case of increases in freight rates and the introduction of surcharges and currency conversion compensation factors.
- a binding international arbitration procedure will help enforce the provisions of the code in the event of disputes.

52. The European Community was divided as never before on this issue, which is so important for its economic future. All possible shades of opinion were reflected by the Nine Member States in the vote:

The following voted for the code:

- Belgium
- Germany
- France.

The following voted against the code:

- Denmark
- The United Kingdom.

The following abstained:

- Italy
- The Netherlands.

The following did not attend:

- Ireland,
- Luxembourg.

The Commission of the European Communities attended as an observer without exercising any influence over the conference.

It is extremely regrettable that the Member States of the Community were not able to adopt a joint position in due time, especially since if they had done so it might have been possible to influence the negotiations so that the end result would have been acceptable to all Member States.

53. As stated in the press, the Commission of the European Communities decided, despite the absence of a Council decision under Article 84(2), to try to achieve a common position at least retrospectively. To this end it submitted to the Council on 15 July 1974 a proposal for a Council decision on the common procedure to be adopted by the Member States in respect of the United Nations agreement on the introduction of a code of conduct for sea transport conferences (Doc. COM(74) 1112 final). The Commission proposes that the Member States should abstain from any measures connected with the signing and ratification of and the accession to this convention (Article 2 of the proposal) and that the Council should decide by 30 June 1975, on a proposal from the Commission, on a common procedure (Article 1 of the proposal).

The European Parliament has so far not been consulted by the Council of Ministers on this matter (2 October 1974).

Your committee would once again like to stress that a common position by the Community on questions of international sea transport policy is an absolute necessity for the countries of Europe.

II. The role of sea transport in intra-Community trade

54. It has already been stressed that there has been a considerable increase in the importance of sea transport for intra-Community trade since the enlargement of the Community. Britain, Ireland and parts of Denmark can only be reached from the other Community countries by air or sea, and all three new Member States have strong national coastal trade such as only Italy and France of the old Community of the Six have.

55. On many routes in the enlarged Community sea transport competes directly with land transport, while in many other cases routes include a sea crossing.

56. For this reason alone the Commission bears a number of responsibilities in the sea transport sector. For example, it has agreed with the British Government that ECSC rail tariff No. 1001 should be extended to cover rail transport by ferry. The following measures have also been taken, initially on a provisional basis: steel undertakings are required to publish supplements for transport operations which include a sea passage; coal producers are required to inform the Commission of the maritime freight rates used in the calculation of alignment operations.¹ Negotiations continue on the further application of the tariff provisions and other regulations contained in the ECSC and EEC Treaties; the outcome of these negotiations will partly affect sea transport.

57. It is obvious that there will be no coordination of these interventions in the activities of the sea transport sector and that optimum results cannot be expected unless the Community establishes a concept for a common sea transport policy at an early date and includes in this concept the measures needed for the commodity markets because of competition with other means of transport.

¹ Seventh General Report on the Activities of the European Community (Doc. 368/73, p. 345, section 403)

(a) Reservation on cabotage

58. Most Member States restrict shipping between two ports of the same territory to vessels flying the flag of the Member State concerned.

59. The continued existence of this reservation on cabotage is not compatible with a Common Market. The table below shows how significant this problem is.

60. Foreign shipping companies wishing to ply between, for example, two French or two Italian ports must obtain authority from the relevant ministry in Paris or Rome. It would appear that on receiving an application of this kind the ministries concerned first ask the national associations of shipowners whether national vessels can carry the freight involved. Not until it has been established that ships of the country are not available is the foreign vessel given the necessary authority. It should be remembered here that in many cases the shipper is forced to pay a substantially higher freight rate than a foreign company in a better position to take the cargo would have charged. The price question, however, apparently plays no part in the authorization procedure. This reservation on cabotage results in increased prices for the shipper and an enormous loss of time as a result of the bureaucracy involved. Shipping circles in the Community also complain that something akin to a restriction of this kind still exists between France and its former territories in North Africa even though the latter gained independence several years ago.

61. The Community should take action without delay to ensure freedom to supply services in this field.

62. As the reservation on cabotage is intended as a means of protecting national shipping companies and as the basic costs of the shipping companies vary considerably from country to country, the proper procedure might well be for the Community to introduce certain harmonization measures so that the basic costs are the same for all and competition does not become cut-throat. The abolition of the reservation on cabotage should therefore be accompanied by a number of harmonization measures, which are also required for other reasons.

The abolition of the reservation on cabotage should, however, not be made dependent on the entry into force of the first harmonization measures. Quite the reverse; in the interests of dynamic development an effort should be made to speed up the harmonization process by the abolition of cabotage.

Maritime operations of the Member States of the Community

1972

Country	Coastal shipping ('national operations')		International shipping (to all countries)		Total
	million tons	%	million tons	%	million tons
Denmark	7.5	16	40.7	84	48.2
Ireland	1.7	4	38.9	96	40.6
United Kingdom	53.4	17	256.8	83	310.2
Germany	3.5	3	124.5	97	128.0
Netherlands	0.0	0	304.6	100	304.6
Belgium	0.0	0	90.5	100	90.5
France	13.7	6	249.2	94	262.9
Italy	47.8	16	259.1	84	306.9
Total	127.6	9	1,364.3	91	1,491.9

Source: Calculated from: Transport, Statistical Yearbook 1972, Statistical Office of the European Communities (to be published shortly)

(b) Competition

63. If only to ensure uniform application of economic policy to all sectors of the economy, a number of fundamental economic system and policy principles governing the rest of the economy must also be applied to sea transport. As the Community is being constructed on the principle of controlled competition or regulated market economy, these principles must also govern any measures taken in the sea transport sector.

64. Any action taken by the Community in the field of sea transport policy must be geared to ensuring that the most favourable means of transport from an overall economic point of view is used in competition between shipping companies on the one hand and between sea transport and other means of transport on the other.

65. Owing to the distinctive geographical features of the Community, sea transport competes with other modes of transport. One of the long-term goals of the Community must therefore be to align the conditions of competition between sea and other forms of transport.

66. These conditions of competition cover:

- sea and air transport, e.g. cross-Channel vehicle and passenger traffic;
- sea and rail transport, e.g. traffic between Italian and French ports;
- sea and road transport, e.g. between Italian and French ports or Danish and German ports;
- sea and inland waterway transport, e.g. traffic between German and Dutch ports or German inland harbours that can be reached by sea-going vessels ('open loop' transport);
- sea and pipeline transport, e.g. traffic from North Africa via Marseilles and the longer French pipeline or via a North Sea port and the shorter pipelines to the Central Rhine area.

67. The time and money involved in setting up a complete work programme might far exceed the possible benefits. The Commission should, however, be given a mandate to prepare a study on this subject and above all the right to act on complaints by those concerned.

(c) Tariff policy

68. Sea transport competes with other modes of transport but it is also a form of transport within the Common Market; it must therefore be integrated into a common tariff structure.

69. Mention has already been made of how the Commission has issued a provisional ruling on freight rates for coal, iron and steel by extending the rail tariff to cover rail transport by ferry and also by requiring steel undertakings to publish supplements for transport operations which included sea passage and coal producers to inform the Commission of the maritime freight rates used in the calculation of alignment operations.

70. What has been said of competition generally also applies to tariffs: a complete programme might involve a greater administrative workload than would be warranted by the potential benefits, but the Commission should be instructed to establish what transport policy guidelines could be applied to intra-Community sea routes. In particular, the Community could ensure greater publicity for and transparency of regular services. It could also be instructed to look into complaints that discrimination had taken place.

(d) Hinterland transport

71. Sea transport is, in the majority of cases, preceded and followed by land transport. Only where processing or consumption occurs on deep-water shores is this not the case.

In the last few years and decades, the activities of ship owners have increasingly extended to land transport. New technical transport methods, such as containers, lash, roll-on/roll-off and even the simple pallet method mean that more and more owners must 'find a foothold in the hinterland'.¹

72. To a much greater extent than in the past, tariff policy decisions are today taken jointly by shipowners and hinterland transport operators. It is thus less easy than ever before to deny the connection between sea transport policy and hinterland transport policy. A modern transport policy must consequently regard the transport industry as a single entity. Port hinterland traffic and the geo-economic implications of the Community's sea transport policy for the overall structure of the economic area of the Member States must therefore be borne in mind with every step forward taken in the common sea transport policy.

In the necessary development of a common regional policy sufficient attention must be paid to port and sea transport needs.

¹ Claus Lau: 'Schiffahrt auf EWG-Kurs?' in Mitteilungen der Handelskammer Hamburg, No. 5, May 1970, p. 306

III. The importance of a sea transport policy for ports and shipbuilding

73. Seaports and the shipbuilding industry cannot be indifferent to the policy pursued by the Community in sea transport towards third countries and in intra-community trade. Coordination of port policy and sea transport policy is therefore indispensable. The need to regard sea transport and hinterland transport as a single entity in a modern transport policy naturally makes it all the more necessary to include ports, the links between shipping and hinterland transport.

74. The shipbuilding industry should be considered in this context not only because it is one of the most important port industries but primarily because measures taken to support shipyards and shipping companies are often inextricably linked. In many cases, the shipbuilding industry receives subsidies which are ultimately intended as aid to shipping companies; in other cases, shipping companies are granted concessions in respect of depreciation and other fiscal advantages, the intention, however, being to assist the shipyards.

75. In all its proposals for a sea transport policy, the Commission must therefore also consider questions of port policy and shipbuilding policy, without, of course, overlooking the distinctive features of ports and shipyards.

(a) Ports

76. All questions relating to cooperation in international organizations in the sea transport sector, shipping clauses in trade agreements, the build-up by developing countries of their own merchant fleets, flag discrimination and 'cheap flags', shipping conferences, the reservation on cabotage and competition in sea transport also affect ports and port policy. Although questions of port administration are not directly affected by these sea transport problems, it is obvious that account must be taken of the interests of ports in all decisions in the field of sea transport policy.

77. Your committee, therefore, feels that the Community must establish a common port policy along with the common sea transport policy, without the one necessarily being preceded by the other.

(b) Port investments

78. Ports are at present being driven to make increasingly large investments as a result of technical developments in sea-going ships, although it is becoming less and less clear whether they will ever be profitable. The picture is the same as in the air transport sector, where the technical development of aircraft means wider and longer runways, the only difference

being that larger sums are involved in sea transport. The big mistake here is that the designers of super ships need not concern themselves with berths for them. Because of keen international competition, seaports simply have the choice of either making the necessary investment or withdrawing from the competition - and usually this means withdrawal not only for the giant ships but also for a good proportion of smaller vessels, which often abandon ports they have previously used when a shipping company has to direct its super-tankers elsewhere.

79. The Commission could be instructed to establish whether the political strength of the Community is sufficient to help find a solution to this problem in cooperation with other international organizations. The aim would be a kind of international convention on maximum permissible dimensions and weights in sea transport. The Community could also make a positive contribution to technical progress through a common research programme (perhaps investigating the possibility of landing platforms that could be constructed in deep water outside ports).

(c) Shipbuilding

80. The Member States of the Community have already made good progress in the right direction in the field of shipbuilding policy. The first achievement was to put a stop to the subsidy competition between Member States.¹ Although shipbuilding policy must primarily form part of industrial policy, it must also be coordinated with sea transport policy.

81. In its proposals to the Council on the shipbuilding industry (Doc. COM(73) 1788 final, Brussels, 24 October 1973), the Commission stresses the difficulty of finding solutions to the problems connected with the shipbuilding policy caused by the lack of a common maritime policy (paragraph 4, p. 8).

82. Your committee, however, feels that the problems of the European shipyards cannot be solved by, for example, compelling European shipowners 'to order European'. This would only shift the problem of the lack of competitiveness on the world market from one sector to another. There is also cause for concern in the following sentence in the above-mentioned proposals (paragraph 2, p.11) should be interpreted: 'In addition, the study group will endeavour to use the Commission's influence on the major bodies in the industry who are the buyers and sellers; it will also endeavour to mobilize existing Community financial resources more effectively in order to modernize the shipyards and

¹ Council Directive of 28 July 1969 on the grant of aids to shipbuilding to offset distortions in competition on the world market (OJ No L 206 of 15 August 1969); Council Directive of 20 July 1972 on aid to shipbuilding (OJ No L 169 of 27 July 1972). As the Council was not able to agree on a common policy for the years up to 1977 by the deadline, the period of validity of the latter directive was extended initially until 30 June 1974 by the Council Directive of 17 December 1973 (OJ No. L 38 of 11 February 1974), and then until 31 December 1974 by the Council Directive of 27 June 1974 (OJ No. L 180/32 of 3 July 1974)

help the industry meet its financial requirements.' In contrast, your committee supports the demand expressed by the shipping companies to be allowed to have their ships built anywhere in the world.

83. The Community's shipbuilding policy should in any case ensure that varying support measures do not lead to a distortion of the capital or operating costs of the Community's shipping companies.

84. An important sphere in which maritime policy and shipbuilding policy must be coordinated is technical research. It would appear that projects for using atomic power in ships have at present every prospect of success and that the Community is even ahead of the rest of the world in this technological field. The institutions of the Community should therefore establish a common support programme.

IV. The harmonization of Member States' legislation on sea transport

85. To allow the Common Market to function satisfactorily, the shipping companies of the various Member States must be able to compete without distortions of basic costs. In other words, all Member States' legislation on sea transport must be combed for cost-distorting factors.

86. The harmonization of legislation, which must follow this combing process, must, of course, not ignore the fact that a more difficult problem for the shipping companies of the Community is probably the unfair competition they face from third countries as a result of differences in legislation. Community activity at world level is therefore likely to have greater impact than the harmonization of legislation at Community level.

Two conclusions must be drawn from this: firstly, harmonization of Community legislation must be based as far as possible on existing world agreements; secondly, where world-wide agreements do not yet exist, the Community must first harmonize the legislation of the Member States to produce the desired result, so that it can then emerge as a stronger force at world level and recommend the common ruling for general acceptance.

87. The list of harmonization measures is fairly long, but it does, in principle, tally with the objectives for inland transport operators:

- safety regulations;
- other technical regulations on construction, equipment, capacity gauging, registration;
- social harmonization, particularly with regard to the number of crew members, social insurance, freedom of movement etc.;
- insurance regulations (freedom of establishment for maritime insurers, etc.);
- harmonization and simplification of customs clearance regulations.

88. Comments will be given on a number of the items in this list of harmonization measures in the following sections, but at this stage it should again be generally emphasized that, as is always the case with harmonization measures, merely adjusting the wording of legislation is of no use if uniform control measures based on the same standards for all are not introduced to ensure consistent enforcement of the laws in all the Member States.

(a) Social legislation

89. In social legislation specifically designed to cover sea transport, there are still cost-distorting differences from one Member State to another which must be eliminated through harmonization.

Your committee supports the Commission's proposal for the formation of a joint committee on social questions in the sea transport sector to advise the Commission. This committee must be able to deliver opinions to the Commission on its own initiative.

90. Your committee would, however, like to stress that none of the proposed measures may be allowed to affect the autonomy of the social partners in the sea transport industry in negotiating wage rates.

91. The Community must make an overall contribution to the upward approximation of working conditions in the sea transport sector. Above all, regulations on the number of crew members must be subjected to a close examination.

Other important subjects for discussion at Community level should be improvements in training, working time, compensation for overtime, leave and insurance cover. Accident prevention regulations should also number among these subjects.

92. Of particular importance for the sea transport industry is the implementation of the principle of freedom of movement of workers. Although the sea transport sector boasts of its international character, there are a number of factors here which are extremely unsatisfactory. There is still no mutual recognition of evidence of qualifications, a subject which has now gained special importance. The Commission has been forced to bring before the Court of Justice an application against France for failure to fulfil Treaty obligations regarding the free movement of workers in sea transport. The point at issue is the application in France of a legal provision which in theory reserves paid employment on French vessels to French nationals.¹ The Court of Justice of the Communities has since found in favour of the Commission and has ordered France to abolish the provisions concerned².

¹ EEC/ECSC/EAEC - Commission: Seventh General Report on the Activities of the European Communities, Brussels - Luxembourg, February 1974, p. 347

² Judgment of the Court of Justice of 4 April 1974 in case 167/73

93. A minimum of social harmonization is needed to provide a just basis for competition between the shipping companies of the Community; efforts should, however, initially be concentrated on improving the working conditions of seamen.

(b) Taxes and subsidies

94. In connection with shipbuilding questions mention has already been made of the subsidies which are paid to shipyards, partly during the construction and partly at the time of sale of sea-going vessels. These subsidies must also be harmonized because the capital costs of shipping companies are affected, which may cause distortion of competition in the Community's sea transport sector.

95. Tax legislation also contains certain specific regulations on sea transport which may distort competition. The problems connected with turnover tax have already been tackled at Community level with the general introduction of value added tax, but the legislation on income tax still includes a number of provisions which may distort competition. An example of this is the legislation on depreciation possibilities, which must be reviewed by the Community. The result could be a general maritime policy instrument, to be used by the Community to avert unfair competition from third countries.

(c) Approximation of commercial law

96. The legislations of the Member States contain a number of special regulations on the carriage of goods and passengers by sea. These range from provisions granting exemptions from the appropriate cartels laws for competition-limiting measures by line conferences to laws on marine insurance contracts and the special liability of ship-owners.

International agreements exist only in limited spheres and even then are not always binding on all Member States. Thus, it is possible for shippers to bear differing degrees of liability for damage to goods carried depending on the country from which they operate. This causes shifts in trade. The same applies to different costs resulting from different insurance provisions and from the imposition on shippers of different legal obligations immediately before and after the actual shipping operation. Hence, this also calls for harmonization as a matter of urgency.

97. It therefore seems desirable that Member States should agree on the harmonization in particular of the following legal spheres:

- the application of cartels law to sea transport,
- the law relating to the chartering of ships,
- the law relating to the carriage of passengers and goods,
- the law relating to the liability of ship-owners and marine insurance,
- the law relating to port establishments.

The following specific comments should be made on the European Parliament's desired approximation of legislation in the above fields.

98. The application of national cartels law to sea transport should be approximated for two reasons. First, unlike the USA for example, the Member States of the Community have no laws applying specially to sea transport conferences, i.e., to the usual cartels in sea transport.

In most cases the national cartels authorities have the power to decide whether and to what extent proceedings should be taken against competition-limiting practices by the conferences. However, since unilateral measures taken by national authorities might cause the shipping companies concerned to divert transport to the ports of other states, the competition authorities may decide not to institute proceedings. Hence, harmonization of the national provisions in this field is necessary if only with a view to achieving economic policy objectives. However, it also seems desirable to supervise certain practices of the conferences more carefully than has hitherto been possible within the national framework, and, in some circumstances, to prevent certain activities (for example the retrospective granting of freight rebates). The Community could adopt an appropriate directive, perhaps following the example of other industrial nations involved in shipping, such as the USA or Canada.

99. It is also desirable that the law relating to the chartering of ships should, at least in its fundamentals, be made more uniform. Member States' provisions on making cargo space available for individual journeys or for certain periods of time are for the most part flexible. In practice, therefore, this sphere is governed mainly by standardized contracts between the parties. However, while many Member States include detailed rules for this type of contract in their laws¹, other legislations make provision only for the analogous application of the provisions of the carriage of general cargoes².

100. Thus, although a national law might have to be applied in respect of a contract on the chartering of cargo space, it is at present possible for economically identical relationships between contracting parties to take different legal forms depending on the national legislation to be applied.

¹ cf. for example, Articles 1-14 of French law No. 66-420 of 18 June 1966 'sur les contrats d'affrètement et de transport maritimes'.

² cf. for example the new Dutch draft law of 1972.

101. Steps to harmonize laws relating to the carriage of passengers and goods by sea are particularly necessary. There are still considerable differences in both sectors with regard to liability for damage. Major international agreements constitute the initial stages of effective harmonization. These include in particular:

- the international agreement on the harmonization of the rules on bills of lading (Hague Rules) of 25 August 1974
- protocol amending the Hague Rules (Visby Rules) of 23 February 1968
- international agreement on the harmonization of rules on the carriage of passengers of 29 April 1961
- international agreement on the harmonization of the rules on passenger luggage of 27 May 1967.

However, not all Member States of the European Community are party to these agreements and not all carriage operations are subject to them.

102. It is urgently necessary for steps to be taken to ensure that a person who sends general goods or undertakes a journey by sea can use the Member States' transport without any fear that the compensation payments he will receive in the event of damage will differ with the legislation to be applied.

103. The law relating to ship-owners' liability and ship mortgages is largely governed by two international agreements to which almost all Member States are party. However, there are considerable differences of detail as regards the covering of claims against ship-owners. For example, the courts decide which law is to be applied on the basis of different criteria. Moreover, not all Member States adopt the same order of priority for the settlement of claims by several ships' creditors. In this connection it would also seem to be essential to abolish any considerable discrepancies that still exist in the law relating to marine insurance.

In this respect, therefore, it is reasonable that the Community should take steps to achieve harmonization.

104. Finally, the law relating to undertakings concerning with loading and unloading and the storage of goods at ports should be harmonized as a matter of urgency. Uniform regulation of legal relationships in this connection could lead to uniform liability for sea transport as a whole, including the land activities necessarily connected with it.

105. In this field there are particularly wide discrepancies between individual Member States. In the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, the legal obligations of port establishments are based on port practices and such

operators do not always bear any minimum liability. France, on the other hand, has a comprehensive law which gives the sender or recipient of goods comprehensive protection against damage in the port area.

(d) Technical regulations

106. A large number of technical regulations governing sea transport have already been harmonized through agreements at world level. However, differences continue to exist from country to country in what is probably a larger number of individual technical regulations, which, in some cases, result in considerable differences in costs for competing shipping companies in different countries.

107. The field covers safety regulations and accident prevention regulations, general regulations on construction, equipment and capacity gauging, registration of sea-going vessels and the transport of dangerous goods.

108. In some cases, the problems have been left over from world-level negotiations at which agreement could not be reached. The Community may be able to get things moving again by harmonizing at its own level, and then renegotiating at world level.

109. In this context, it should also be pointed out that the Community's maritime policy may be considerably affected by certain agreements and outstanding problems of international maritime law, such as the extension of territorial waters beyond the traditional three-mile zone, the exploitation of the continental shelf and other parts of the seabed, agreements on the prevention of marine pollution, to which a separate section is devoted below, etc. All these agreements have implications for the technical side of sea transport. Some of these questions were discussed at the Conference on the Law of the Sea in Caracas. A further United Nations Conference will shortly perhaps lead to a World Convention. The Community should be jointly represented at this conference.

(e) Prevention of marine pollution

110. In its programme of environmental action, the Commission states that 'of all the different kinds of pollution, marine pollution is now, and will be for a long time to come, probably one of the most dangerous'¹. What is alarming about marine pollution is not merely its disastrous effects on the biological and ecological balances, but also the difficulty of finding satisfactory solutions. The multiplicity of sources of pollution and the complexity of the legal status of the sea (high seas, territorial waters, adjoining zones) make it extremely difficult to work out a coordinated policy.

¹ Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 3/73, p. 25.

111. Although initial efforts to combat the growing pollution of the seas were made soon after the Second World War, public opinion did not really awake to the seriousness of the problem until the 'Torrey Canyon' went aground off Cornwall in March 1967, releasing 118,000 metric tons of oil into the sea and causing untold damage. Public awareness has been reflected in a number of national and international measures, which have, however, remained too fragmentary to provide a satisfactory long-term solution.

112. In the abovementioned action programme, which was adopted by the Council in July 1973, the Commission lists the following principal sources of pollution: sea transport, deliberate dumping of waste at sea, exploitation of marine resources and discharge of waste from land. Naturally, only the first of these categories comes within the ambit of the present report.

113. The discharge of oil by ships, and more specifically, the cleaning out of oil tankers, is seen as the principal source of pollution. According to a study by the 'Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft' (German Research Association), an estimated 5 to 10 million metric tons of crude oil are discharged into the sea every year.¹

114. It is therefore hardly surprising that a number of international agreements have been concluded, some applying throughout the world, others on a regional basis, to combat this particular form of marine pollution, viz:

- London Convention of 12 May 1954 for the prevention of the pollution of seawater by hydrocarbons; at the instigation of IMCO this Convention was amended and amplified in 1962, 1969 and 1971 (the amendments have not yet entered into force);
- Brussels Conventions of 29 November 1969 covering action at sea in the event of an accident causing or capable of causing pollution by hydrocarbons and the third-party liability for damage due to pollution by hydrocarbons. (IMCO, not yet in force)
- 1971 Convention setting up an international fund for compensation for damage due to pollution by hydrocarbons. (IMCO, not yet in force);
- London Convention of 2 November 1973 for the prevention of marine pollution by ships (IMCO, not yet in force);
- Bonn agreement of 9 June 1969 on cooperation in the prevention of the pollution of the North Sea by hydrocarbons;
- Helsinki Convention of March 1974 on the protection of the marine environment of the Baltic Sea.²

¹ OJ No. C 22, 7 March 1974, p. 30

² At the Rome Conference in February 1974, the Mediterranean states agreed to look into the possibility of concluding a similar agreement.

115. Although your committee welcomes these initiatives it nevertheless regrets the lacunae in the agreements and the shortcomings directly related to them, such as:

- lack of coherence between the various agreements, numerous cases of duplication and conflicting provisions;
- failure of contracting parties to ratify, whereby several of the above agreements have not yet come into force or have been implemented by only some of the states concerned;
- inadequate enforcement of the provisions of the agreements and the penalties for their infringement.

116. It is this last point which is of major importance in sea transport.

As long as the punishment of infringements and violations remains the exclusive prerogative of the flag state, the parties to an agreement are powerless to act against ships flying the flag of a country that has not acceded to that agreement. In view of the cost of implementing obligations specified in agreements, there is a real danger of competition distortion.

117. The Committee on Regional Policy and Transport therefore considers it desirable that the Commission should as soon as possible carry out an investigation into the question of responsibility for the financial burden arising from measures to prevent marine pollution. Nor can we allow conditions of competition to be distorted through the additional costs incurred by shipowners and transport users as a result of compliance with agreements and conventions, e.g. harbour dues for tankers being cleaned out in port rather than at sea.

118. Your committee also expresses the hope that the European Community will succeed in presenting a common front in this matter at the coming Conference on the Law of the Sea in Caracas, and that the Member States will give maximum support to the Commission's proposals for effective control and sanctions (as contained in the working paper on the preservation of the marine environment - SEC(74) 862 of 20 March 1974, Annex).

119. Your committee believes that the best chance of finding a satisfactory solution to the problem of marine pollution caused by shipping lies in the creation of a world-wide agreement, with harmonization of implementation orders at Community level.

(f) Controls

120. It has likewise already been emphasized that even the best of harmonization measures will have no effect unless uniformly strict controls are carried out and sanctions imposed in all countries to enforce common legislation.

121. This applies not only to ships of the Member States but also to third country vessels calling at Community ports.

122. The joint and increased use of controls might in itself contribute substantially to solving, for example, the problem of 'cheap flags'. As things now stand, the introduction of more stringent controls in one Member State of the Community will only result in the ships affected calling at a nearby port in another Member State. If, however, all the Member States take joint action, almost the whole coast of the Western European sub-continent would be closed, for instance, to vessels which sail without adequate life-saving and fire-fighting equipment and expose their crews to danger or their passengers to tragic accidents.

(g) Statistics

123. One of the first steps that the Community should take is to develop a joint set of statistics on sea transport as the necessary background to decisions on the common policy. The Commission's Statistical Office might be instructed to set about harmonizing and improving the statistics on sea transport in cooperation with the Member States' statistical services. The shipping company circles concerned have already promised to cooperate in this work (Annual Report of the CAACE for 1973, p. 12).

Summary

124. Finally, your Committee would like to point out that the Community must not remain a free trade area without a common external economic policy. As it advances towards economic and monetary union, the Community must assume its full responsibility in the world economy. This also implies a common position in world maritime policy matters. In its own interests the Community must combat flag discrimination and other obstacles to world trade; in the interests of all maritime nations it must, speaking with one voice, make a major contribution to the settlement of problems outstanding at world level; and in the interests of the proper functioning of the Common Market in Europe it must help to achieve greater freedom of movement for people and services between the Member States.

125. For this reason your committee requests that the above motion for a resolution be adopted so that, in partial application of Article 84(2), the Council of Ministers can give the Commission a mandate as soon as possible to submit practical proposals for initial steps in the sphere of a common sea transport policy.