



# The Porthole

Volume 15 No. 06  
June 2015

The newsletter of the South Australian Branch of the Company of Master Mariners of Australia.

PO Box 1, PORT ADELAIDE, SA 5015



## Branch Master's Comments:

Our peripatetic Branch Master is about to return home, scheduled to arrive on Tuesday, 23 June 2015, just in time to welcome the Governor at the Branch meeting on the following day. During a telephone conversation last Tuesday, he said that he was about to have lunch in the New Forest. So here, in the absence of his comments, are photos of the New Forest.



As we have to have a very brief business meeting before the Governor arrives at 12:20, it is important that the meeting starts promptly at 12:00 noon, with everyone seated at the tables.

Ian Dickson.

Acting Branch editor.

## Inside this issue:

Minutes of the May 2015 Branch meeting.	2/3
Bob Buchanan's Caribbean & W. Mediterranean cruise.	4
HMAS Hobart launch.	4/5
"Sailing Towards a Future."	5/6
Summary of proposed Coastal Shipping Reforms.	6
"Troubled Waters Ahead": a legal assessment of the proposed coastal Shipping Reforms	7/9
First All-electric Car Ferry	9

## Guest Speaker:

His Excellency the Honorable Honourable Hieu Van Le AO

**The next Branch Meeting will be held at the Largs Pier Hotel, 198 The Esplanade, Largs Bay, on Wednesday, 24th June 2015, at 1145 for 1200.**

**Please confirm your attendance at the lunch or register your apology before 1200 on Monday, 22nd June 2015, with**

**Ian Dickson (8396 1030)**



The Company of Master Mariners of Australia Ltd. is a Company established to promote and further the efficiency of the Sea Service generally, and uphold the Status, Dignity, and Prestige of Master Mariners in particular.

**The Company of Master Mariners of Australia Ltd., S.A. Branch.**

Branch Meeting at the Largs Pier Hotel, on 27 May 2015, at 1200.

Minutes

1. Meeting opened at 1200 hrs. In the absence of the Branch Master, the Past Branch Master welcomed members.
2. Present:  
Members: Captains Westley (Past Branch Master), Buchanan, Carr, Carrington, Dickson, Ferrao, Hammond, Hehir, Holmes, Kemp, & Rajagopalan, and Mr Hales.
3. Apologies: Sir Eric Neal, Captains Bourne-Jones, Carter, Fraser, Ganesan, Jayasuriya, Lydell, Marshall, Parsons, Pearson, Phillips & Pronk, and Lt Cmdr Wynne.
4. Minutes of last business meeting: 29 April 2015 (circulated in the Porthole). Capt Hammond proposed that the minutes be accepted as a true and correct record of proceedings. Seconded by Capt Rajagopalan and carried.
5. Business arising from the minutes:

a) Speakers:

June: His Excellency the Honourable Hieu Van Le, Governor of South Australia  
July: To be advised  
August: To be advised (Stand by: Paul Phillips on "Recent Visit to Egypt")  
September: To be advised.  
October: To be advised.  
November: To be advised.  
Suggestions Mike Carrington: Topic: "Diamond dredging in Namibia" (Mike Carrington).  
 Speaker from the Australian Maritime & Fisheries Academy (Paul Phillips).  
 Tony Elliott, Funeral Director: Topic "Body on the Beach".  
 Christine ???, Commonwealth Bank: Topic "Credit Card Care".  
 Alan O'Connor, ???: Topic "Habitat for Humanity".  
 Hayley Everuss, State Manager, Oz Harvest: Topic "Delivering Goodness".  
 Brian Gilbertson, ???: Topic "Christmas Pageant-Behind the Scenes".  
 Tony Carr, ???: Topic "Kakoda Trail".  
 Des Evans, ???: Topic "Tour de France".  
 Kate Linley: Topic: Under Keel Clearances. (Howard Pronk?)

Visits:

Suggestions: Australian Maritime & Fisheries Academy: bridge & engine room simulators and ship fire fighting training facility (Paul Phillips).  
 Working tug visit (Mike Carrington).  
 One & All: Visit: To be arranged (Ian Dickson).  
 Le Favre High School: To be arranged (Ian Dickson).

- b) "Master Mariner" journal. Mike Carrington: Possible topic: "Diamond dredging in Namibia" (Mike Carrington)?  
 More articles required.
- c) Development of maritime facilities and construction programs: The Branch Secretary wrote to the Federal Secretary on 26/11/14; still no reply (Paul Phillips, Ian Dickson).
- d) Company Plaques: The Branch Master advised that he had received 5 plaques and tabled one for Members' inspection. The Branch Court has decided that one should be given to each of the following: the Governor, the SA Maritime Museum and the "One and All". The 2 remaining are available for purchase at \$55 each.

6. Treasurer's report: (Table report)

CBA Cheque a/c balance at 22/04/15	2,238.73	Bendigo Bank deposit balance at 22/04/15	2,676.76
Income: Subs.	0.00	Interest added quarterly	<u>0.00</u>
Expenditure:	<u>0.00</u>	Bendigo Bank deposit balance at 20/05/15	<u>2,676.76</u>
Balance at 20/05/15	<u>2,238.73</u>		
		Bendigo Bank Term Deposit at 1/02/15	7,051.66
		Re-invested for 9 months from 1/02/15 @ 3.40%	

Capt Dickson proposed that the Treasurer's report be accepted. Seconded by Capt Holmes and carried.

7. Membership:Applications:

Applicant	Status sought	Branch	Master's Certificate			Occupation/ Position
			No.	Date	Place	
Simon Andrew GAMBONI	Associate	Melbourne	N/A	N/A	N/A	Solicitor involved in the maritime industry in Melbourne
Michael Charles DESA	Ordinary	Western Australia	112	1992	Dublin	Process Advisor, Chevron
Mohd Isnan RAHMAN	Associate	Queensland	N/A	N/A	N/A	Retired. Container terminal operations consultant

Ratifications: Nil.Branch Members:

Category	Number		
	Financial	Unfinancial	Total
Members	7	0	7
Seagoing members (incl. tug crews & pilots)	2	1	3
Retired members	15	0	15
Associate members	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Total paying members	26	2	28
Honorary members	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Total Levied Members	<u>30</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>32</u>
Life Members			<u>2</u>
Total Branch Membership			<u>34</u>

8. Correspondence 18/04/15 to 15/05/15: (Summary tabled). Inwards correspondence received & outwards correspondence approved at the Branch Court meeting on 20/05/15.

9. Federal Matters:

- a) Federal Court: Nothing to report.  
 b) 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary book: Nothing to report.

10. Motions on Notice: Nil11. General Business:

- a) River Murray houseboat ramble Capt. Hammond stated that he will prepare a talk for a future meeting.  
 b) HMAS "Hobart" launch Capt. Carr reported on the launch, which he attended.  
 c) Cape-size ships loading ore from Whyalla. Capt. Ferrao advised that he had been appointed Harbour Master at Whyalla, which involved supervising the ore loading operations. He stated that he would be prepared to give a talk about the exporting operation.  
 d) Jim Morely Mr Hales advised that Jim was in intensive care in Wakefield Hospital, as he had contracted a golden staph infection after an uncomplicated knee operation.

12. **The next Branch meeting will be held at 1145 for 1200 on Wednesday, 24<sup>th</sup> June 2015, at the Largs Pier Hotel, Largs Bay. The guest speaker will be His Excellency the Honourable Hieu Van Le, Governor of South Australia, who will talk about his life experiences. Wives, partners and guests are invited and early advice of attendance will be appreciated.**

13. Business meeting closed at 1235. Members and guests adjourned for lunch.

Meeting resumed at 1315 when Captain Buchanan gave a talk about his recent cruise from the Caribbean to the western Mediterranean.

## CARIBBEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN CRUISE.

At the May Branch meeting, Bob Buchanan gave an illustrated account of his latest cruise, which he evidently enjoyed very much. The vessel was the MSC Musica, approx. 100,000 tons with passenger capacity of over 3,000 persons. Crews are similar to other cruise vessels usually from lower cost countries, and the majority of the hotel staff were from Bali, and are very comfortable with and communicate well with Australians.



Santa María La Menor (Cathedral of Saint Mary the Merciful) (left), the building of which was begun in 1512 and completed in 1540.

The departure port was La Romana in the Dominican Republic, close to Christopher Columbus' first landfall in the Caribbean in 1492 (not quite China that he was seeking). This enabled Bob to spend time in the capital, Santo Domingo, before boarding the vessel. Santo Domingo is a very interesting place historically, as it was founded by Christopher Columbus' brother, Bartholomew, in 1496, and is the oldest continuously inhabited European settlement in the Caribbean. Bob stayed in the Old Colonial Zone, which contains many buildings built in the early days of settlement, including the Cathedral



MSC Musica departed La Romana for seven Caribbean ports in as many days, before heading off to Funchal and the Mediterranean. Bob had visited a number of the ports some decades ago and was impressed by the development that had occurred in the interim, particularly in Funchal. He was also impressed by the Montenegrin and Dalmatian coasts (left), particularly the well preserved Roman buildings.

—oo0000oo—

## **LAUNCHING OF HMAS "HOBART" No. 39.**

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> May last, Captain E Carr attended the launching of the locally constructed Air Warfare Destroyer, HMAS 'HOBART', at the Techport Australia shipyard situated on the Port river at Osborne, South Australia, and recorded here are his observations of the ceremony.



South Australia put on its best weather for this event, clear blue skies, warm sunshine and negligible wind. The vessel was standing on the shiplift platform with bows pointing to the river and I am told it had been previously partially immersed to check for leaks!

The ceremony was attended by the Governor of South Australia and his wife, the Premiers of South Australia and Tasmania, the Chief of the Navy, Vice Admiral Tim Barrett, and the Minister for Defence, Mr. Kevin Andrews. The wife of the Tasmanian Premier, Mrs Nicola Hodgman, was the Sponsor for the ship and performed the launching ceremony.

There were numerous other dignitaries present and a large presence of officers of the Royal Australian Navy. An unfamiliar site in SA was presence of the large number of Captains, Commodores and above, as well as officers of lower ranks. Also observed were two senior officers from the US Navy and one other Admiral, who, I suspect, was from the Spanish Navy.

The ceremony started at 1000 hrs when the lowering of the vessel on the shiplift platform commenced. There were addresses from the Minister for Defence, who acknowledged the "Valley of Death" period between completing existing vessels under construction, and commencing new construction, but in typical politician style made no comment on the future direction of the Federal Government in regard to further naval construction. The SA Premier's address lauded the ability of the state to construct this vessel, but I found his speech was mostly of a contentious political nature. Then the Chief of Navy, Vice Admiral Barrett, addressed the gathering, and his address was then followed by a short religious dedication service conducted by an ADF Chaplain.

The lowering of the vessel ceased about 1130 hrs when Mrs. Hodgman was invited officially to name and launch the ship. This ceremony consisted of cutting a ribbon leading from the wharf up to the forecandle head, where a framework had been mounted



present dispersed. Later that afternoon tugs towed the ship to the fitting out berth, where she will remain for another year, being fitted out before sea trials can begin. There are two sister ships still under construction in the yard.

—oo0000oo—

*The following article is part one of a six part series that has appeared on Ross Delaney's Gilead Logistic blog. The future scenario contemplates the feasibility of going small again in respect of ships and ports directly serving regional markets. It also reflects insurers' concerns in respect of risk and mega container ships. Part of the scenario includes the employ of wind energy harvesting devices on geared container vessels. Each of the six part series is individually linked on his blog.*

To review the series as a whole, or to extract the remainder of the individual URL links, the blog page is: <http://www.gileadlogistic.com/blog>

## SAILING TOWARDS A FUTURE

### ***What might a commercial cargo ship of the future look like?***

Speculation encountered in respect of future technology is often derived from the engineered approach, from the modern world's Isambard Brunel style of imagining "big things". Many "futuorologists" flirt with a simple concept for the building of something, or



Maersk Mc-Kinney Møller by Slawos, Wikipedia

achieving a limited goal-set, and that pleases them. The problem, however, with narrowly conceived thinking (or solutions), are unintended consequences. This is especially so in heavily networked environments such as those we encounter in supply chains.

Could today's biggest & most narrowly conceived merchant shipping solutions already be displacing better solutions? Could they prove to be ones that fail us comprehensively in the emerging supply chain sense?

Before we answer that we should acknowledge that there can be extended periods of supply-sided solution imposition, including times where poorly conceived networks are built to support inappropriately selected core assets. Unfortunately, even before the network degeneration is observed, the consequences derived from the poorly allocated capital may already be significant.

The largest container ships being built today carry 4-5 times the number of containers that the largest similarly tasked ships did in recent decades. When we look at the recent past trend in container ship development it is plain that a single "desire" (i.e.: economy of scale on a port-to-port basis), as conceived by shipping corporations, their financiers, and the port authorities/states that they serve, has driven the "go big" developments.

There are some alternate future developmental paths under consideration, as may be identified here: <http://theloadstar.co.uk/wind-technology-could-give-shipping-lines-double-digit-fuel-savings/>. And perhaps these too, at first glance, appear to have been narrowly conceived.

In respect of the current largest modern cellular container cargo ships, those with heights that can run to over 70 m above the water line, with lengths of over 400m, and being around 60m wide, the prospect of safely plonking any sort of wind energy capturing device - clear of the hull and the cellular based container stack - is unrealistic. Even the flying of a sail or kite from such a vessel would likely require a keel depth that would render them an unrealistic proposition in the real world.

You might say to yourself that the market will eventually sort this out – that not all ships are large today – but you would be ignoring the trend – the weight of numbers. All ships - in all the major and minor trades - are getting larger. The largest container vessels employed in the major east-west trades have grown from those able to load 4,000 TEU (twenty foot equivalent shipping containers) just decades ago to those now able to load 20,000 TEU. And this growth rate is now



Two Flettner rotors of the E-Ship 1 by Carschten, Wikipedia

being replicated in percentage terms by nearly the same degree in the north-south trades. In addition, Maersk recently reported the introduction of a vessel of over 3000 TEU in the intra-Europe trades.

So concerning the above, perhaps all we might say today is that narrow engineering elements are currently in the ascendancy among those commanding outcomes in shipping infrastructure investment. Later, we will seek to convince you that the trend may be reversed.

Today, however, we will conclude with just a cameo in respect of the largest of ships. It is highly likely, over time, that there will be a fire that overwhelms the on-board fire suppression systems of a +20,000 TEU container ship. What happens then?

You might consider the potential aggregate size of cargo and/or environmental claims given a catastrophic event involving a container ship of this size. You might even contemplate what the effect of the declaration of general average might mean to insurers and those cargo owners at risk.

And, in respect of environmental risk and salvage, as some insurers have commented, there may be no existing external fire-fighting or cargo handling equipment that can be effectively brought to bear out of port on a ship of this size. Fire is only one risk among others, and insurers are concerned...

[www.insurancejournal.com/news/international/2015/03/26/362150.htm](http://www.insurancejournal.com/news/international/2015/03/26/362150.htm)

—oo0000oo—

### COASTAL SHIPPING REFORMS: CHANGES AT A GLANCE.

#### **What you need to know**

Details provided in a Norton Rose Fullbright infographic – 2 June 2015

#### **Key Messages**

1. Points of difference between Australian and foreign vessels now limited.
2. Increase in opportunity for foreign owned vessels.
3. No need to negotiate with Australian vessel owners.
4. Reduced paper work.
5. Concerns that crewing and wage requirements for foreign vessels which engage in coastal trading less than 183 days will create a 'race to the bottom'.
6. Legislation is currently being drafted to be presented to Parliament before the end of June 2015.

	What's out	What's in
Permit system	3 tiered Licence system: (General Licence - Australian vessels; Temporary Licence – Foreign vessels meeting certain requirements; Emergency).	Single Permit system: (Coastal Shipping Permit)
Access	Unrestricted access for Australian vessels with General Licence only. Temporary Licence – Restricted access, negotiation with general licence holders required.	Unrestricted access to all vessels – Australian and foreign – no negotiation required.
Duration	General Licence – Australian vessels: 5 years. Temporary Licence – Foreign vessels: 12 months.	All vessels: 12 months.
Voyages	Temporary Licence requires at least 5 voyages to be nominated at time of application. Permit limited to those nominated voyages.	Unrestricted. No requirement to nominate voyages at time of application.
Crewing/Wages Requirements	General Licence: Australian crew, Australian wage conditions. Temporary Licence: Minimum wages set out in Part B of Seagoing Industry Award 2010.	Foreign Vessels: If coastal trading for more than 183 days: "Top 2" Australian requirement. All crew must be paid minimum wages set out in Part B of Seagoing Industry Award 2010. If coastal trading for less than 183 days: Existing International on board arrangements will apply
Reporting	Temporary Licence requires voyage reports to be issued after each voyage.	2 standard reports per permit year. Minister can request an interim report.
"Importation"	Uncertain as to if or when vessels are imported for Customs purposes and customs duty payable.	No importation/customs duty payable when: Dry-docking Moving liquid fuel products from offshore to mainland.
Dry-docking	Time in dry-dock counts towards coastal trading period.	

## TROUBLED WATERS AHEAD?

### AUSTRALIA TO OPEN UP COASTAL TRADES TO INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING.

By Gavin Vallely and Caroline Brown (Holman Fenwick Willan)

In his election victory speech in September 2013, Prime Minister Abbott declared, "Australia is under new management and is once more open for business".

The high cost of shipping on Australian coastal trades that are regulated by federal cabotage legislation has been a constant thorn in the side of Australian business. On April 8, 2014, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development, Warren Truss, announced the release of an options paper on approaches to regulating coastal shipping in Australia, directed at addressing the lack of competitiveness of Australian shipping. Press reports appeared on a roundtable meeting in Canberra on February 2, 2015, between Minister Truss and shipper interests to discuss "options" in relation to the reform of Australia's cabotage regime.

Subsequent reports have suggested that the Federal Government is proposing to introduce legislation, designed to streamline the current regulatory system that was introduced by the previous Labor Government, with reference being made to replacing the existing multi-tiered licence system with a single permit for all ships (Australian and foreign) which operates to grant unrestricted access to coastal shipping. Among other things, the proposed reforms will be directed at achieving equal treatment of Australian and foreign ships for the carriage of Australian coastal cargo.

The rationale reportedly provided by the government for the proposed reform is that, since it came into force in 2012, the cabotage regime, as revised under the Coastal Trading (Revitalising Australian Shipping) Act [CTA], has acted as a barrier to competition and market entry by foreign ships, resulting in a substantial increase in the cost of coastal shipping services which, in turn, has impacted negatively on Australian business, and led to a high level of uncertainty and red-tape without achieving any of the objects of the CTA.

The cost differential between freight rates for Australian and foreign flagged vessels was considered in the decision of the Federal Court of Australia last year, in *CSL Australia Pty Limited v Minister for Infrastructure and Transport*, in which reference was made to evidence of the freight rate offered by CSL Australia, in respect of its Australian flagged tonnage, being more than US\$12 more per metric tonne than a comparative quote provided in respect of foreign flagged tonnage - this differential generated an annualised differential to the charterer of at least AUS\$4 million for the trade in question.

However, as the government does not have control of the Senate, it remains to be seen whether any amending legislation will be blocked by the Labor opposition, in conjunction with minor parties with whom they can form a majority in the Upper House. Predictably, the proposed winding back of the CTA is opposed by the Maritime Union of Australia (MUA). In a press release, MUA National Secretary Paddy Crumlin said that: "the MUA strongly urges the Abbott government to retain and improve the Coastal Trading Act," going on to comment, "the (planned) changes could impact around 2,000 direct jobs and up to 8,000 associated jobs." Given the potential impact on jobs referred to by Mr Crumlin, it is reasonable to expect that Australia could be in for a period of industrial volatility in the marine sector.

In this context, it is relevant to note that the MUA has been prosecuted successfully by Australia's federal competition regulator (Australian Competition and Consumer Commission - ACCC) and fined for unlawful boycott conduct under Australia's competition legislation, which is capable of being a strong deterrent against boycott activity, such as unlawfully hindering or preventing, or attempting to hinder and prevent, vessels from sailing, unless the ship owner/charterer agreed to use MUA labour to clean the vessel's holds, or otherwise engaging in unlawful action to stop vessels from sailing, such as pickets, threats of pickets, action to delay, demands for payment in lieu of cleaning, etc.

The secondary boycott provisions are contained in the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth) [CCA], and have been subject to many amendments since they were introduced in 1997. In its Draft Report on its review of competition law and policy published on September 22, 2014, the Harper Committee expressed the view that secondary boycotts were harmful to trading freedom and therefore harmful to competition. The committee suggested that the ACCC should focus on enforcing the relevant prohibitions in the CCA in a timely way, to counter the perception that there is insufficient public enforcement of the prohibitions and to ensure they operate as an effective deterrent.

#### **What is a secondary boycott?**

Generally, a secondary boycott involves two or more persons, in concert with each other, engaging in conduct to hinder or prevent a third party from:

- Supplying goods or services to a fourth person;
- Acquiring goods or services from a fourth person;

Where the conduct is for the purpose, and would be likely to have the effect of:

- Causing substantial loss or damage to the business of the fourth person.
- Causing a substantial lessening of competition in a market in which the fourth person trades.
- Preventing or substantially hindering a third person from engaging in trade or commerce involving the movement of goods between Australia and places outside Australia.

The last prohibition is particularly relevant to potential responses to any changes to the cabotage regime.

The prohibition specifically excludes the situation where the third or fourth person is the employer of any of the persons engaging in the conduct.

The secondary boycott prohibitions apply to employees who are members of a union. There is also a rebuttable presumption that a union is engaging in conduct if two or more of the persons engaging in the conduct are members or officers of a union.

### **Defences**

There are two exclusions from the prohibition which apply where the dominant purpose of a boycott substantially relates to:

- Remuneration, conditions of employment, working hours or working conditions of employees engaged in the conduct.
- Environmental protection or consumer protection and the conduct is not industrial action.

### **Preventing or hindering**

The term "hindering" means, "in any way affecting to an appreciable extent the ease of the usual way of supply of goods or services." Conduct must be assessed in the context of all the circumstances and the mere act of picketing may not necessarily constitute an act of hindering or preventing supply or acquisition if it is undertaken in a peaceful and non-threatening way.

However, the conduct of preventing or substantially hindering supply or acquisition can be engaged in by threat and verbal intimidation as well as physical interference with the actual activities.

### **Acting in concert for prohibited purpose**

The relevant provisions of the CCA require that all of the relevant persons engage in conduct in concert with the relevant purpose. There must be evidence of communication between the parties as to their proposed course of action and the acceptance of the obligations to undertake that conduct by at least one party.

Without evidence of specific communication between a union and a member of a union in relation to enforcing a picket line on a particular site, evidence that a union member acted in accordance with a long-standing policy of his union not to cross a picket-line was not sufficient to establish the member acted in concert with the union.

On the other hand, members of a union were found to have acted in concert with their union in circumstances where bans were imposed by the union against independent contractors at separate industrial sites. The court relied on the close temporal connection between the imposition of the bans at the separate sites and the fact that the decision by the union to impose the bans had been communicated to members in the union's official magazine.

In determining whether conduct has been engaged in for a particular purpose, the court considers the "operative subjective purpose" of those engaging in the conduct, that is, what was the real reason or object in the minds of those engaging in the conduct. In cases where an individual's purpose is in question, best evidence of purpose will often be the oral testimony of that individual.

The purpose of causing substantial loss or damage need not be the only purpose of a secondary boycott for the prohibition to apply. The purpose of causing loss or damage may be established even where it is a means of achieving another primary purpose. In a case where the respondent union imposed bans on ships exporting the plaintiff company's coal by preventing another company from supplying tug services to the plaintiff, the union gave evidence that the ultimate goal of the ban was to crew the plaintiff company's ships with Australian seamen.

The union argued that they did not have the proscribed harmful purpose; rather they wanted to protect their members' jobs. The union's defence was rejected on the basis that, while that may have been the union's ultimate purpose, the union failed to establish that there was no other prohibited purpose.

It follows that even if a potential consequence of the opening up of Australia's coastal routes to foreign shipping is the loss of employment for some MUA members, this will not protect prohibited secondary boycott activities from being sanctioned.

### **Injunctive relief to prevent secondary boycotts**

Interim injunctions can be granted pursuant to the CCA to prevent secondary boycotts. The test for determining whether to grant interlocutory relief is, firstly, whether there is a serious question to be tried, and, secondly, that the balance of convenience favours the granting of an injunction.

In order to obtain an interim injunction, there must be some evidence going to each of the above-mentioned elements making up a secondary boycott. An applicant bringing an action for breach of the secondary boycott prohibitions can face difficulty in adducing sufficient evidence that the respondents have acted "in concert" for a prohibited purpose.

However, a successful applicant may recover substantial damages as a result of boycott conduct.

In addition, if a remedy has been ordered against a union, failure to comply with the order may result in the union being fined for contempt of court.

### **Preparing to respond to boycott conduct**

There are some basic steps that owners and charterers of vessels can take in order to be best positioned to obtain expedited relief from secondary boycotts. These include:

- Ensuring that all contractual arrangements relating to provision of services are in writing properly executed by the parties to the arrangements, and that detailed documentation is available to show the parties' expectations with

respect to the timing and scope of those arrangements.

- Keeping accurate and detailed records of all communications with union officials and representatives, in particular with respect to any threats or demands. In some cases, it may be appropriate to make audio recordings of face to face discussions. Otherwise, confirm the substance of any relevant discussions in writing as soon as possible after the discussion has occurred.

*Ausmarine, Vol 37, No 8, June 2015, pp 22 & 23.*

—oo0000oo—

### **First Car Ferry Powered by Electric Drive System**

2013-Jan-09



Together with the Norwegian shipyard Fjellstrand, Siemens has developed the world's first electrically powered car ferry. The 80-meter vessel can carry 120 cars and 360 passengers. From 2015 onward, it will serve the route between Lavik and Oppedal, across the Sognefjord. The ship's batteries will be recharged in the breaks between crossings, a procedure which only takes 10 minutes. The vessel currently serving this route uses on average one million litres of diesel a year and emits 570 metric tons of carbon dioxide and 15 metric tons of nitrogen oxides. The electrically powered ferry was developed for submission to a competition organized by Norway's Ministry of Transport. As a reward for winning the competition, the shipping company Norled has been granted the licence to operate the route until 2025.

Copyright: Norled

Reference Number: IN20130102-02

—oo0000oo—