



# THE PILOT

The official organ  
of The United  
Kingdom Pilots'  
Association

No. 199 (Vol. 52 No. 4)

December 1981

---

## NINETY-FOURTH CONFERENCE

Held at the London Penta Hotel  
24th-26th November, 1981

---

### THE MINISTER'S SPEECH

Thank you very much indeed for inviting me to speak to your Conference today. I particularly welcome this opportunity to speak to you, and I will tell you exactly why. Not long after I began my new job in September, as a minister in the Department of Trade, with special responsibility for shipping, a delegation from your Association came to see me. What that delegation had to say very much impressed me. I was impressed by the clarity of their arguments. I was impressed by the vigour of their arguments. And I was impressed by the reasonableness of the manner in which they put their arguments. They certainly opened my eyes on a number of important points. And they certainly gave me a lot of food for thought.

Mr Chairman, I must admit also that I greatly liked the general atmosphere of goodwill and good nature in which they discussed matters — in spite of the deep concern and sense of frustration which I know that pilots feel, and which I well understand. When, therefore, the delegation asked me, at the end of the meeting, if I would attend this Conference, I at once decided to arrange my work schedule so that I could accept.

But, around the same time as I was meeting your delegation, I was also seeing the world of pilotage from several other angles. I was able to go out in a Trinity House launch from Harwich to the pilot cutter near the Sunk Lightship, and I spent a most interesting and instructive time there, in company with Mr James and Mr Richardson, watching pilots board vessels nearby. I visited Trinity House itself. I received a delegation of representatives from the London Sea Pilots. I received delegations from several other interested parties, such as the General Council of British Shipping, and from other groups representing shipping interests. I had various meetings with Dr Rebbeck, and was entertained and informed at a pleasant and valuable dinner as a guest of the Pilotage Commission.

In short, I sought to immerse myself, as thoroughly as I reasonably could, in the many aspects of pilotage.

The reason why I did this, I wish to explain very clearly to you. The Secretary of State for Trade, and myself as the minister in the Department of Trade, with special responsibility for shipping, have a specific judicial role to exercise in many pilotage matters — a judicial role placed upon us by Act of Parliament. It will fall to me to take decisions on pilotage matters in light of the advice put to me by the Pilotage Commission. These will frequently be very important decisions. They will be decisions which may be challenged in the Courts.

I therefore decided that if any conclusions I might reach were to be just, and fair, and ultimately acceptable to all parties concerned, I must take every reasonable opportunity to listen for myself to views expressed by

*(continued on page 95)*

## UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS' ASSOCIATION

20 Peel Street, London, W8 (01-727-1844)

<i>President</i>	.. .. .	The Rt Hon The Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal	
<i>Past Presidents</i>	.. .. .	1884-1910 Commander George Cawley (Licensed Pilot and Founder President)	
		1910-1923 Mr Michael Joyce, MP (Limerick) (Licensed Pilot)	
		1923-1925 The Hon J M Kentworthy, MP (Hull Central)	
		1925-1942 Lord Apsley, DSO, MC, MP (Bristol Central)	
		1946-1947 Admiral Lord Mountevans, KCB, DSO	
		1949-1962 Captain Sir Peter MacDonald, KBE, MP (Isle of Wight)	
		1963-1976 The Rt Hon James Callaghan, PC, MP (Cardiff South East)	
<i>Honorary vice-Presidents</i>	.. .. .	Messrs F Berry, OBE, T Morgan, H J Wynn	
<i>Vice-President and Chairman of Executive Committee</i>	.. .. .	D I McMillan (London River) 61 Pine Avenue, Gravesend, Kent (Gravesend 65154)	
<i>Vice-President</i>	.. .. .	B I Evans (Milford Haven) Rock Cottage, Wellington Gardens, Milford Haven, Dyfed (Milford Haven 2917)	
<i>Honorary Treasurer</i>	.. .. .	J Bennett (South East Wales) Brent Knoll, 92 Port Road East, Barry, South Glam. (Barry 734724)	
<i>Elected:</i>		<i>Executive Committee</i>	
1980	J A Hogg (Tyne) 20 Langdon Close, Preston Grange, Tynemouth, Tyne & Wear	(North Shields 573864)	
1980	G M Logie (Yarmouth) Claremouth House, 71 Marine Parade, Gorleston-on-Sea, Norfolk	(Gt Yarmouth 62932)	
1980	N C Walker (London Sea Pilots North) Esplanade House, 32 Kings Quay Street, Harwich, Essex	(Harwich 2224)	
1981	D W Davis (London Sea Pilots South) Reams Cottage, Mill Lane, Worth, Deal, Kent, CT14 0DU	(Dover 612591)	
1981	J Bennett (South East Wales) Brent Knoll, 92 Port Road East, Barry, South Glam.	(Barry 734724)	
1981	C C Wilkin (Humber) 273 Beverley Road, Kirkella, Hull, North Humberside	(Hull 653323)	
1982	G A Coates (Tees) 9 Stokesley Road, Marton, Middlesbrough, Cleveland	(Middlesbrough 315236)	
1982	W Brown (Clyde) "Pentland", 66 Belmont Road, Kilmalcolm, Renfrewshire		
1982	M H C Hooper (Southampton and Isle of Wight) 60 Spencer Road, Ryde, Isle of Wight, PO33 3AF	(Ryde 62474)	
<i>Trustees</i>	.. .. .	S Green, F Janes, R Balmain, G C Howison	
<i>Hon Medical Adviser</i>	.. .. .	Dr F S Preston	
<i>Hon Financial Adviser</i>	.. .. .	F Moss	
<i>General Secretary and Legal Adviser</i>	.. .. .	E Eden, MA	
<i>Secretary</i>	.. .. .	Miss Y Blake	
<i>Auditors</i>	.. .. .	Messrs Arthur Andersen & Co. London	
<i>Finance Committee</i>	.. .. .	The two vice-Presidents and Honorary Treasurer	
<i>Editor of "The Pilot"</i>	.. .. .	David Colver	

those like the pilots who are closest to the real work, to see for myself something of that real work, and to make certain that I was not prejudiced one way or another simply because those who held one set of views had better access to the media, or even to Members of Parliament.

That, Mr Chairman, is what I have been doing, and that is why I have been doing it.

All those meetings with delegations, all those visits, all this immersion in the complex world of pilotage, has convinced me of two things. First, the subject is sadly bedevilled by many misunderstandings and misapprehensions. For example, I know, from what your delegation said to me when we met, that your members feel that many of the powerful points you have made over the past months have never received an answer at all — let alone an answer you regard as satisfactory.

Second, I am convinced that we must sort matters out quickly. There has been too much delay.

To promote understanding, therefore, — to promote understanding not least as far as I myself am concerned — I am now inviting representatives of the interests concerned with pilotage to gather for a seminar in the New Year. The seminar will be informal and, I hope, friendly and constructive. I shall be asking your Association specifically to advise me on what exactly should be discussed, and who should be invited.

The seminar will not seek to make decisions, but it will seek to promote a wider understanding of the true importance of pilotage to the safety and prosperity of our shipping.

In conclusion, thank you once again for asking me here today, firstly, to speak and secondly, and more importantly, to listen to what you have to say on a subject about which nobody knows more than you.

## THE NINETY-FOURTH CONFERENCE

With Mr Dan McMillan in the Chair, the Conference was opened on the Wednesday morning by the President, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, who emphasised the great contribution of pilots to the safety on the seas and the surrounding shores at a time when accidents can be so extensive. He also stressed the need for unification if only to ensure that the Minister is not presented with an appearance of dichotomy, which could only lead to decisions not being to the liking of the body of pilots or, worse still, no action at all.

The business of Conference was on this occasion preceded by a prayer from Ian Evans

*God grant us . . . the vision to transcend parochialism in order to achieve national purpose,*

*the sense of idealism and rationality of thought to achieve unity,*

*the wisdom to think and debate objectively in order to achieve consensus, and*

*the courage to take whatever decisions and consequential action necessary to achieve what is rightfully, ours.*

After dealing with the subjects of Unity, Alterations of UKPA Rules and the General Secretary's Report, the afternoon session was a Joint Meeting with the Marine Pilots' Branch of the T & GWU at which Resolutions 1, 2 and 3 were debated. During the Joint Meeting, Conference was honoured by the arrival of the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Mr Iain Sproat, MP, accompanied by Mr Gavin Lord, and Mrs Shaaron Watkin, of the Department of Trade.

After delivering a lucid and forthright address which was warmly received, the Minister was invited by the Chairman to stay and listen to the proceedings to the limit of his time and inclination. It was to the gratification of the Conference that the Minister stayed throughout the rest of the afternoon and heard the whole of the debate on Resolutions 2 and 3.



## REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY AND LEGAL ADVISER

A great deal more understanding of the pilotage service has been shown in the past by Government Ministers of different political shades, in particular by such great men as the late Sir Winston Churchill and Mr Lloyd George, who have expressed publicly their support for pilots in carrying out their duty.

Indeed, such understanding of the pilotage service was shown by the present Government when in opposition during the Committee Stage of the pilotage provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1979.

There can of course be no aim for pilots more noble, and none more necessary — with such disasters still vivid in the mind of the public as the *Torrey Canyon* and the *Christos Bitas* — than to ensure by means of pilotage the protection of our environment by the efficient and safe movement of ships in and out of the congested and complex waters of our estuaries and ports.

To ensure continuing high standards of safety in modern conditions, Parliament established a Pilotage Commission to act as a source of advice to the Secretary of State for Trade in the belief that the Secretary of State will act upon such independent advice.

Statements which have so far emanated from the Marine Division of the Department of Trade, on behalf of successive Shipping Ministers, have prolonged the period of uncertainty over the future of the pilotage service. It is pertinent to note in this connection the length to which the previous Shipping Minister, Lord Trefgarne, was prepared to go to influence the Pilotage Commission in their advice on matters affecting pilotage reorganisation. The following advice was sent by Lord Trefgarne to the Pilotage Commission —

“You said that the Commission would find it helpful to be aware of the considerations that Ministers would wish it to take into account in formulating its advice on the London District. Lord Trefgarne has asked me to say that he would not be prepared to endorse new bye-laws for London (or any other port) which had the effect of adding significantly to the financial burdens of UK coastal and near-continental shipping. He is concerned, too, that pilotage authorities’ charges for vessels in the hands of certificate holders should reflect clearly understood principles. He would see merit in most of the cost of licensed pilot services falling on those who use them on a day-to-day basis, with certificate holders bearing only a small part of the burden; he thinks it would be desirable, too, for vessels in the hands of certificate holders to be charged a rate proportionate to the likelihood of their requiring licensed pilot services. Perhaps the Commission would consider this approach? Lord Trefgarne has noted that it may be necessary for charges to certificate holders to include part of the cost of compensating redundant pilots, but he recognises that the Commission’s consideration of what proportions would be appropriate may well have to be deferred until agreement has been reached on wider compensation issues and the principal source of funds for this purpose identified.

Lord Trefgarne has asked me to say that he recognises that this guidance may require some modification in the assumptions adopted by the Commission in their earlier recommendations: he is aware of the reliance that the Commission have necessarily placed on the recommendations of SCOP and ACOP, but he would like the Commission also to have close regard to the adverse financial effects that any changes in pilotage might have on the shipping industry. He recognises, too, that formulating principles to govern charges may add to the Commission’s burden and so delay the time when new bye-laws could come into effect. But he thinks that pilotage authorities’ charges must be determined in a way that can be understood by those who have to pay them and that the principles must be seen to be fair and reasonable.

I am informing Trinity House, the APAUK, the UKPA, the GCBS, the MBOA, the PSA, and the BPA of this guidance.”

It is all too obvious from the above statements, and not least from other statements which have appeared in the press grossly misrepresenting the pilotage provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1979, that the Pilots’ Organisations had to set the record right. The Pilots’ Action Group was set up to counteract the orchestrated

misrepresentation which, if left unchallenged, would undermine the safety of the environment to the detriment of the public. So far, three information sheets have been circulated to every Member of Parliament, Local Authorities with coastal areas, national environmental bodies and persons with special interests.

Never before, since the Pilots’ Organisation called a national meeting for the first time ever in Birmingham in 1971, has the morale of the Pilotage Service been so low. With safety standards being lowered due to commercial pressures to such an extent that our ports and coastlines are seriously at risk, the Pilots’ Organisations are for the second time in the history of pilotage facing a similar situation which may call for national or local action. The need for the Pilots’ Organisations to protect the interests of pilots and the pilotage service has never been more obvious. The UKPA, in its national role, can make a tremendous contribution to the progress of our profession by uniting it together at this time.

I would venture to say to you all, that it is high time that all pilots should unite. If that is the path that pilots are to take, there could be no aim for the pilot profession more noble (as I said at the beginning of my report) and more necessary in the interest of the pilotage service.

### How effective is the Pilotage Commission?

In last year’s report, I drew attention to the Pilotage Commission’s assurances to UK pilots, made throughout the medium of the press on 30th April 1980, on the following points —

1. The Commission was absolutely determined to ensure fair and equitable treatment of pilots. This meant that adequate compensation arrangements would have to be established at a local or, if necessary, a national level **before certificates could be granted** in a particular district.
2. The Commission was also determined to protect the viability of local pilotage services. In some districts this could mean that the issue of certificates would be delayed; in others, certificate holders would have to **pay a high level of contributions** to ensure a continued adequate income for the service, including the pilot boat service.
3. The Commission emphasised that Section 10 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1979 provided safeguards which could **and would be used to protect pilots’ livelihoods** and the local pilotage services.

Some twenty months have elapsed since those assurances were given to pilots, and we are no nearer to solving the problem of compensation under the provisions of Section 4(3) of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1979. We have made written and oral representations to successive Shipping Ministers. We have also made similar representations to the General Council of British Shipping requesting the General Council to comply with its contractual obligations under paragraph 23 of the National Agreement which states that —

*Despite the General Council’s belief in local arrangements, the industry supports the pilots’ organisations in their submission that the Pilotage Commission’s powers will be extended by Order under Section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1979 so as to enable them to make compensation schemes where there is any deficiency in the arrangements already made on a local basis or if it is not possible to tackle the problem locally when a need arises and no facility has been created.*

The Chairman of the GCBS Pilotage Policy Committee, Mr Peter Howells who signed the National Agreement on behalf of the GCBS, indicated to the Pilots’ Organisations, at a meeting in September this year, that the GCBS were reluctant to commit themselves until the GCBS financial obligations for compensation under Section 4(3) were more clearly defined.

The Pilotage Commission itself is fully alive to the situation and has repeatedly requested the Secretary of State for Trade to implement the compensation provisions of Section 4(3) but so far without success. Although Parliament has made enabling provisions for compensating pilots, the present Government refuses to implement them until the GCBS agree to make the necessary finance available.

How effective has the Pilotage Commission been in protecting pilots' livelihoods under Section 10 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1979 which effectively empowers pilotage authorities to refuse to issue further pilotage certificates because of the manpower situation?

Notwithstanding the existence of Section 10, the British Transport Docks Board, acting as the Pilotage Authority for the Humber Pilotage District issued pilotage certificates to the financial detriment of the pilots and against repeated representation by the Local Pilotage Committee and the UKPA. A request by the UKPA to the Secretary of State for Trade to revoke the pilotage certificates granted by the British Transport Docks Board was also turned down.

Is it conceivable that the advisory functions of the Pilotage Commission have become ineffective? If so, should the Commission's advisory powers be strengthened?

With the Secretary of State for Trade and his Shipping Minister and not least some Pilotage Authorities ignoring the Commission's advice, are we not fast approaching the stage when serious thought should be given, pilot by pilot, district by district, to a detailed strategy of action or series of action?

During the year, almost every pilotage district was faced with at least one or more problems. The UKPA was involved in almost every one of these problems and although some have been settled to the satisfaction of the pilots of the district, a large number are still under consideration. I will report on these and other national problems at the Conference.

Before concluding my report, I would like to commend to you the dedicated work of the two vice-Presidents and members of your Executive — and not least the Local Secretaries — who have spared no effort in progressing the interests of the members of the UKPA. Ian Evans and Neil Walker deserve a special tribute for their marathon work on the Pilotage Commission.

Up to two months ago, Yvonne Blake has been playing a most active part in the day-to-day work of the UKPA. Northwithstanding her illness, she has continued to be a tower of strength in keeping the UKPA wheels in motion by her advice both to me and my temporary assistant. She is presently making progress and we hope to see her back in the not too distant future.

Finally, I should like to thank the Editor of *The Pilot* who continues to further the interests of the Association.

After presenting the above report which had been circulated to delegates, Mr Eden went on to mention some additional matters.

#### **Mitchell Case**

Last year I gave you an up-to-date report on the Mitchell Case. As you know, the late Laurie Mitchell lost his life on 2nd September 1974 whilst attempting to board a passenger ship called the *Eagle* under severe weather conditions. There seems to be strong evidence to indicate that the construction of the pilot ladder was faulty.

At long last I can report that according to the solicitors concerned, Stephens and Scown of St Austell, the case has been set down for trial at the High Court in London on 15th March 1982. As you will expect, leading Counsel has been engaged.

#### **1980 NMB Award**

As members will be aware the 1980 NMB Award of 12% came into effect on 1st November 1980. The Award was not confirmed until 1st May 1981 and this gave rise in most cases to a back-dating temporary surcharge on the rates up to the end of this year.

As you know, the 1980 NMB Award included — as from 1st September 1981 — an extra five days leave entitlement from 127 days to 132 days or a 2% increase on earnings instead of leave improvement. We had a meeting with Mr Peter Howells, Chairman of the Pilotage Committee of the GCBS for the outstanding 2% amount of the NMB Award. We based our legitimate claim on the assurances given by the GCBS at a meeting held with Government Departments on 17th February 1978, accepting the contractual obligations under the longstanding Letch Agreement that the full NMB Award should be extended to pilots' earnings. As a result of the assurances, the pilots received the full 1977 NMB Award. The GCBS have now advised the Pilots' Organisations that they are unable to agree with our submission that implementation of the 1977 NMB Award represents a precedent for full implementation of the 1980 NMB Award to pilots. The GCBS argue that in 1977 the problems were created by the Government's pay policy and, they go on to say, that in an effort to overcome these (I quote) "GCBS and the pilots made common cause to the Authorities". The only "common cause" that the pilots organisations made was to be present at the meeting with the Government Departments. The GCBS were under no obligation to assure the Government Departments concerned that they (the GCBS) had consistently implemented the NMB Award in full.

It was because of these assurances given by the GCBS freely, and without any duress on anybody's part that led the Department of Trade to state in a letter dated 7th March 1978 that they have considered with the other Government Departments concerned (I quote) "whether it would be consistent with the pay policy for pilots to receive the award in full, including the productivity payments. In view of the existence of the Letch Report, and recommendations as a pre-pay policy collective agreement to match NMB Awards and the consistent application of those recommendations by the parties to the Letch Report, we are able to accept that there would be no breach of the pay guidelines if you were again to decide that the full NMB Award should be extended to pilots' earnings."

Notwithstanding the above assurances that NMB Awards were implemented in full, the GCBS are now telling the Pilots' Organisations that they are (I quote) "satisfied that the leave of pilots and that of officers have historically been treated independently and that this is reflected in the Letch Agreement". How can an organisation of the standing of the GCBS say one thing about the interpretation of the Letch Agreement on 17th February 1978 to Government Departments and some 3 years later on 19th October 1981 write to the Pilots Organisations adopting a completely opposite view!

The Joint Executive are progressing the matter before taking further action.

#### **1981 NMB Award**

Once again the 1981 NMB Award of 8% is made up of fringe benefits and will again be dealt with under the Letch Agreement until such time as the earnings of pilots are brought within the National Agreement. We already know that of the 8%, 0.3% is a fringe benefit in respect of improved pension arrangements.

We have urged the GCBS to provide an interim award and agreement has been reached, or should be by tonight, for a 7.7% interim award. (On the Thursday morning, Mr Eden was able to announce that there was agreement on the wording of a letter from the Pilotage Commission to all Pilotage Authorities on that day stating an Interim Award of 7.7% would be effective from January 1st 1982. Should the award be later increased there would be adjustment to the rates. The Chairman then commented that the 2% outstanding from the 1981 NMB Award was still under negotiation).

#### **Sullom Voe and Orkneys**

You may recall that in 1976 a memorandum of understanding was drawn up by the then Under-Secretary of the Department of Trade in respect of Sullom Voe and Orkneys which clearly stated that an amended Order should take effect in 1981.

Much correspondence and meetings both in London and Sullom Voe and Orkneys have taken place since 1976 to sort out various problems, some with success and others yet to be resolved. In September this year, your Chairman Dan McMillan and I, with representatives of DoT and GCBS, attended meetings at Lerwick and at Kirkwall. It became fairly clear that both the Shetland and Orkney County Councils were not prepared to change the present arrangements. After much debate, I suggested that Working Groups should be set up for both districts to reach agreement on amendments to the present organisations of pilotage in Sullom Voe and Orkneys by the end of the year. This suggestion was accepted by the parties concerned and both the Pilots' Organisations and DoT are now awaiting the conclusions of the two Working Groups.

From information I am receiving at present, it would appear that both Island Councils have recently adopted a non-compromising attitude to any of the proposals put forward by the Pilots. It is pertinent to ask who has encouraged them to adopt such an attitude of non-cooperation even before they have had time to discuss them in the Working Groups?

Needless to say, the UKPA will continue to give the pilots of both Islands their full support in their request for amendments to the present organisation of pilotage in both Sullom Voe and Orkneys.

#### Aberdeen

In November last year, I attended a DoT inquiry in Aberdeen on the objections lodged by the GCBS in regard to the constitution of the proposed Aberdeen Pilotage Authority. After much discussion and correspondence, and notwithstanding DoT's view as well as the Pilotage Commission's view that the formula which emerged from the meeting in November in Aberdeen was reasonable in all the circumstances, the GCBS continued to maintain their objection. They continued to do so even though complete accord had been reached locally. It was not until 28th October 1981 that the GCBS had agreed to withdraw their objections. The constitution of the future Authority will be 2 pilots, 1 shipowner and 2 Harbour Board nominees (*ie* General Manager and Harbour Master).

#### Humber

You will all be aware, from my circular letter, of the situation on the Humber in regard to the granting of Pilotage Certificates. Notwithstanding the numerous letters I have written, on behalf of the Humber to the Pilotage Commission, to DoT and others and the various meetings, the BTDB have totally ignored the wishes of the Humber Pilots. In the case of pilotage certificates, the BTDB have gone ahead without any consideration to the wellbeing of the pilots. What is more appalling is that notwithstanding the Commission's recent advice to the Secretary of State to promote a Pilotage Order to set up a new pilotage authority for the Humber a recommendation which was supported by SCOP, ACOP, further obstacles have been raised by DoT which seem to indicate that there can be no question of the Secretary of State promoting a Pilotage Order in the terms that the Commission recommend. Lip service continues to be paid by successive Shipping Ministers who have expressed great concern about the continuing poor relations between the Humber pilots and the BTDB but when asked to promote an Order by the Commission, seem to shy away from taking any action.

There is little doubt in my mind that even though the question of compensation could be resolved, the BTDB would find — as they seem to hint in their latest letter to me — other excuses to prevent the setting up of a Local Pilotage Authority. Having drafted a Pilotage Order, I am inclined to think that either the UKPA or the Commission should go ahead, bearing in mind that, whoever does it, the Order is likely to be subject to special parliamentary procedure.

#### Smaller Pilotage Districts

It has always been the policy of the UKPA to fight for the smaller districts as it does for the larger districts. One example, which culminated in an new level of earnings under the National Agreement for Wisbech, shows clearly to what length the UKPA is prepared to go to help smaller districts. Following a meeting in

Wisbech when agreement was reached between the Authority and the UKPA on a new level of earnings, the Authority proceeded to increase the rates to meet the increased level of earnings. The GCBS lodged objections which were strongly resisted by the UKPA and this resulted in the Wisbech Pilots retaining the increased level of earnings. The Restructuring of Earnings sub-Committee, to which the matter was referred, eventually approved the new level of earnings for the Wisbech pilots. Larger districts have also benefited from UKPA representation. Some, such as the Clyde, proved beneficial to the pilots; others, such as the Humber and the Tyne, still remain to be settled. I do not intend to go into the numerous districts in which the UKPA has been involved but if any delegate present wishes to highlight his district, please do not hesitate to do so.

#### Discussion

**Mr Rhodes** (*Medway*) said, after a gap of nine years since his last conference attendance, he wanted comment on the apparently slow progress, yet in a constructive way. However, he first wanted to make clear the great appreciation in his station for the efforts of the Secretariat and of the Executive, especially for the part-time efforts of Edgar Eden and Yvonne Blake. He and others were concerned for Yvonne's early recovery and wished to convey the gathering's affectionate thoughts.

The report was a sad one — a repetition of circular letters, the sins and omissions of GCBS — on which little reaction by members seemed possible. There was no indication of the Executive recommending anything new in their approach. A few years ago pilots appeared to have initiative, highlighted changes, made proposals on how to overcome difficulties and captured public imagination. Such initiatives were currently considered and often adopted in the EEC but nothing was achieved here. We had been diverted and mesmerised by SCOP so that UKPA was now on the defensive.

There was a continuous change in the type of man needed for pilotage and we should fix our attention less on the past century and more on the next with its growing technology. Perhaps there should be more of the younger members on the Executive.

We needed to promote the image of "augmenting the command team of a ship".

**Mr Eden** was grateful for the reference to Yvonne Blake: members would recall that the 40-hour week was due to her many efforts. He went on to point out the three major messages in the report, all of which had reached the people who really mattered —

1. the Commission set up by Parliament and the Minister refusing to act on independent advice;
2. the Action Group's circular of the Joint body which went to MPs and 27 papers in the UK and resulted in several MPs writing to the Minister;
3. the question whether the Pilotage Commission, as a result of its advice being ignored by the Minister, should launch a PR campaign as has been done by the GCBS with the purpose of convincing the Minister that the Commission should have teeth.

**Mr Barwick** (*London River*) referred to the 10 year protection clause in Section 10 and that two of these had already gone — had this been put on record to the Minister? It may need renewal at the end of the ten years and should we have something down on paper now?

Mr Eden said the UKPA had seen each of three successive Ministers concerning both Section 10 and Section 4(3).

**Mr Ross** (*Falmouth Sea*) wished to thank all members on behalf of Mrs Mitchell for their support.

After several other members' queries had been answered from the platform, **Mr Leigh** proposed, and **Mr Rhodes** seconded, the adoption of the Report and this was carried unanimously.



## Report of the JOINT RULES REVIEW WORKING PARTY

In introducing the following Working Party Report, Mr Coates (*Exec*) explained to the UKPA meeting that the same Resolution was simultaneously being considered by the Maritime Pilotage Branch meeting and that there was some reason to believe that steps would be taken by the MPB to put into effect their joining UKPA on January 1st, 1982.

### Report of the Joint Rules Review Working Party

The Working Party has met four times and has corresponded to consider the Resolution . . .

*That the Joint Executive Committee appoint a Working Party to review the constitution of the UKPA with the object of amending such constitution in order to make it acceptable for all UK Marine Pilots. The amendments to include, inter alia, provision to enable the UKPA to register in that name as an independant certificated Trade Union should the majority of members so resolve and also, if considered necessary, to make special provisions for the smaller pilotage districts. . .*

The Rules command general acceptance except in relation to Rule 10, the Election of the Executive Committee. The TGWU (Marine Pilots Branch) Rules differ by formally assuring Regional Representation while the UKPA has a National election at Conference.

We RECOMMEND that the existing informal regional balance upon the UKPA Executive Committee should be enshrined in the Rules. To that end it is proposed that a preamble of this nature is used in Rule 10.

#### ELECTION OF OFFICERS

10. For the purpose of the election of officers, the Membership shall be divided into Regions as follows . . .
- (1) London, South and West with Southeast England to include I O W.
  - (2) London, River and North with East Anglia to include Gt Yarmouth.
  - (3) England East Coast.
  - (4) Scotland.
  - (5) Northern Ireland and Northwest England.
  - (6) Wales, Europilots and Southwest England.
- Each Region shall have not less than two nor more than three elected Members, including vice-Presidents, at any one time, except in the event of an election which results in a Region having less than two Members in consequence of a shortage of candidates from that Region, the numerical constitution of the Executive shall be reduced to allow for that Region's deficiency.

We propose to change the first line of present Rule 10 to read "four Members" instead of "three Members" in order to continue the members' three year term of office.

In addition, it is proposed that, in Rule 9, the number of Executive Members be increased to 12.

We further RECOMMEND that, in order to strengthen the Association, a new paragraph be added to Rule 11 as follows . . .

- (g) The Executive Committee shall have power to take any action whatsoever, including the appointment of a negotiator, which is calculated to attain the objects of the Association or to further the interests of the Members, provided that such action is lawful and not contrary to the Rules and policy of the Association.

The concept of registration as a Trade Union no longer exists. However, we are assured that nothing in these Rules should prevent the Association from applying to have its name entered in the lists of Trade Unions maintained by the Certification Office under the 1974 Act. The Certification Office is currently considering whether or not pilots can be defined as 'workers' within the meaning of that Act.

The Working Party recommend these rule changes as a contribution to the wellbeing of all pilots in Britain. It is further suggested that, while in no way limiting access to any Executive Member, a sub-Committee be set up to consider the problems associated with smaller Districts.

In order to assist an orderly transition, we suggest that after the UKPA and MPB elections in 1981, the two Executives combine until the 1983 Conference when these amended Rules shall apply to elect a COMPLETE committee. Retirements in 1984, 1985 and 1986 shall be decided by lot in such a manner that not more than one member for a Region shall retire each year and, as far as possible, achieve equity amongst the Regions. 'Limited Life' Rules will be needed to cover this transitional period.

We also RECOMMEND a review of the size of the Executive Committee in 1986 after three years operation.

*G A Coates, R A Glover, J Bennett, J A Hogg, H Frith, G C Howison, J D Evans, M H C Hooper*

*June 1981*

### ALTERATIONS TO UKPA RULES (*as amended at the 93rd Conference, 1980*) of which due notice has been given.

- (a) **Election of Officers (Rule 10)**  
That Rule 10 be suspended at the conclusion of the 1981 Annual Conference.  
(From The Executive)
- (b) **Annual Meeting or Conference (Rule 21)**  
That in lines 39 and 40 of Rule 21 the words "to elect the Executive Committee and Officers as described in Rule 10" be suspended at the conclusion of the 1981 Annual Conference.  
(From The Executive)
- (c) **Election of Officers (Rule 10) and Annual Meeting or Conference (Rule 21)**  
That Rules 10 and 21 hereby suspended in whole and in part respectively be reinstated at the beginning of the 1983 Annual Conference.  
(From The Executive)

#### Note

The above alterations to UKPA Rules give effect to the recommendations of the Working Party as set out in Circular Letter No. 429 dated 29th June 1981. Further amendments will be needed before 1983 Conference to implement the second stage of the Working Party's recommendations.

Messrs Mann (*London Sea S*), Parry (*Port Talbot*), Sidley (*London River*) and others raised points of interpretation and formulation in the proposed rules. Mr Eden explained that there would remain complete freedom for any member to join any party or union, or no union at all: the "limited life" amendments to the

rules merely suspended until 1983 the election of the UKPA Executive. In the interim, the Joint Executive would have the task of sorting out the details and there would be ample opportunity for the members to choose and approve.

Further queries arose on the representation of smaller districts and the Chairman reminded Conference that it had been decided last year to set up a sub-committee to consider smaller districts and the Joint Executive must be given the opportunity to develop the lines of a working formula. **Mr Howison (Clyde)**, who claimed the benefit of objectivity, since this was his last meeting before retiring, put in a plea for ideas for consideration to be put to the Executive in writing.

At the vote, the Joint Rules Review was **accepted** in principle, there being only one vote against. The Alterations to Rules (items (a), (b) and (c) above, relating to suspension) was **carried** unanimously.

At the joint meeting, that afternoon, it was announced that the MPB had voted (13 for and 5 against) to proceed with the steps toward unity and would formally inform the Chairman of the Transport and General Workers' Union who would be expected to pass on the Resolution to the Secretariat of the T & GWU.

## ALTERATIONS TO UKPA RULES

*(as amended at the 89th Conference in 1976)*  
*of which due notice has been given.*

- (a) **Constitution (Rule 3)**  
*Delete in line 2 of Rule 3 "on active service"*
- (b) **Membership (Rule 4)**  
*Delete in line 3 of Rule 4 "on active service"*

**Note:** The purpose of this amendment is to enable pilots who are seconded abroad for a specified period of time to remain in membership of the Association so long as they remain duly licensed pilots of a UK Pilotage District.

- (c) **Officers (Rule 6)**  
*That in line 3 of Rule 6 delete "a Junior Vice-President/Treasurer" and insert "a Junior Vice-President and a Treasurer".*  
*(From The Executive)*
- (d) **Officers' Qualifications (Rule 7)**  
*That in line 6 of Rule 7 after "Vice-Presidents" insert "the Treasurer".*  
*That in line 14 of Rule 7 after "Vice-President" insert "or Treasurer".*  
*(From The Executive)*
- (e) **Executive Committee (Rule 9)**  
*That in line 3 of Rule 9 delete "Treasurer".*  
*That in line 5 of Rule 9 after "Stated" insert "of whom one shall be the Treasurer".*  
*(From The Executive)*

- (f) **Election of Officers (Rule 10)**  
*That in lines 11, 34, 42, 49 and 58 of Rule 10 delete "Treasurer".*

*That between lines 44 and 45 of Rule 10 insert "A Treasurer shall be elected from amongst the Members of the Executive Committee".*

*That between lines 50 and 51 of Rule 10 insert "Treasurer".*

*That after "and" in line 58 of Rule 10 insert "a Treasurer".*

*(From The Executive)*

**Note:** The above alterations to the Rules are to separate the Office of Treasurer from the Office of Junior Vice-President, and to elect the Treasurer from amongst the Members of the Executive Committee.

In introducing the proposed amendments, Mr Eden explained that a licensed pilot is an active pilot so long as he retains his license. He has a need for insurance during an overseas secondment. This prompted **Mr Marshman (Medway)** to ask if the health and environmental conditions overseas created an additional loading on the policy. **Mr Coates (Exec)** replied that the Executive had resolved with the insurers that if UKPA membership was retained they would cover members serving overseas with no change to everyone's rate. Mr Eden added that the cover for Deep Sea pilots had always been valid anywhere and **Mr Butler (Deep Sea)** said he only knew of two claims on the policy for injuries when abroad and both had been settled satisfactorily.

**Mr Howison (Clyde)** drew attention to the dramatic fall in traffic in the Clyde leading to an arrangement whereby the eight men on temporary secondment to other stations retained a full entitlement, for a maximum of two years, to retain their Clyde licence, to return to the Clyde and to retain their insurance. The Clyde troubles of today might be the pattern on other districts tomorrow.

**Mr Hunter (London Medway)** said it was important that members continue in the scheme even when having to seek other temporary employment in pilotage. A station left working with less men may therefore have to delay the retirement of members on the station.

The Resolution was **carried** unanimously.

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### Nominations for Vacancies

The THREE senior members of the Executive Committee due to retire under Rule 10 were Messrs G A Coates (Tees), G C Howison (Clyde) and M H C Hooper (Southampton and Isle of Wight).

Messrs COATES and HOOPER were seeking re-election, but Mr Howison was not.

Only one nomination had been received, that of Mr W BROWN (Clyde), so that a ballot was not necessary.

The Chairman welcomed Bill Brown to the Executive and also, joined by Ian, thanked Geoff Howison for all the valuable effort he had put into the Executive.

A deep appreciation was then expressed to Keith Grant for all his efficient work in "managing" the Conference.

## RESOLUTIONS

## 1. From: London Sea Pilots (North)

*THAT this Conference deplores the deliberate delay by the GCBS in the implementation of the 1980 National Agreement on the Earnings of Pilots and urges that we take the earliest and strongest action to ensure that this Agreement is honoured.*

**Mr McLaren** (*London Sea N*), in proposing the Resolution said that since 1957 the working conditions were unchanged yet there had been a steady diminution in the living standards of pilots imposed by the British ship owners. Part of the blame lay with the pilots who found difficulty in putting a price on value. Since the 1979 Act, the GCBS had seemed intent on "pilot-bashing", yet how many pilots work more than 1 British ship in 10? (From the assembly only two could answer in the affirmative) Nevertheless, GCBS interfere with the earnings of pilots and often go out of their way to treat such specialists as parasites. Professionalism in pilotage was never higher, yet the dignity which went with the profession was now less apparent than the respect accorded to a shipping agent's clerk.

The 1980 Agreement, full of caveats and not yet ratified, would advance pilots to half the earnings of their German and French counterparts. Apart from extracting from the Agreement that which was advantageous to shipowners it had become clear that the GCBS is ignoring the document.

**Mr Sidley** (*London River*) was very happy to second the motion. **Messrs Barwick** (*London River*), **Godden** (*London Sea S*) and Sidley commented on the looseness of the Agreement and questioned the wisdom of our tendency to enter into a "gentlemen's agreement". **Mr Owen** (*Liverpool*) reminded Conference that it was a "package deal" and all parties had a responsibility to see that trade in a port is advantageous to it in respect of the number of pilots operating there.

The Resolution was carried by an overwhelming majority (4 con) in the Joint Meeting and reaffirmed in the UKPA meeting *nem con*.

## 2. From: The Executive

*THAT where in a pilotage district shore based radar is intended to be implemented, and should there be any attempt to change the present law, namely section 30 sub-section 5 of the Pilotage Act 1913, to introduce any new vessel traffic services organisations, licensed pilots shall be responsible for this operation.*

**Mr Wilkin** (*Humber*), proposing the Resolution, began with two definitions. Firstly, Section 30(5) of the 1913 Pilotage Act states If any person other than the Master or seaman, being a bonafide one of the crew of the ship, is on the bridge or in any other position (whether on board ship or elsewhere) from which the ship is navigated, that person shall for the purpose of this Section be deemed to be piloting the ship unless the contrary is proved.

Secondly, the meaning of Vessel Traffic Services was stated by Captain Wepster of the Marine Research Institute, Netherlands, at the Fourth International Symposium of Vessel Traffic Services held in Bremen, 1981, to be the organisation of the movement of ships in order to guarantee an effective, smooth, unobstructed traffic flow through the entire port area at all times. The important main items of a VTS system will be —

1. the clear identification of vessels and their cargoes, etc;
2. a continuous knowledge of each vessel's individual position and progress in any traffic system;
3. to give advice and guidance to each individual vessel to guarantee its safe transit through the traffic system;

4. to identify a dangerous traffic situation which may develop at a peak traffic time in grey or dangerous areas and to give advice accordingly.

The introduction of port radar systems in early 1954 has subsequently prospered, in varying degrees of sophistication, around most of the major ports in the world. Port Authorities have, under the emotive word "safety", been persuaded by academics and technical sales representatives into thinking that, unless they produce a sophisticated traffic system, they are not being seen to keep up with their neighbouring ports. Notwithstanding the advantages of all the new technology and a naive tendency to take the decision-making away from the bridge, sections 44 and 30(5) of the Pilotage Act 1913 were not amended in the 1979 Merchant Shipping Act.

A recent development which has taken place in Europe is the Project for Cooperation on Science and Technology (COST). This originated in the growing public concern over serious marine accidents and their varying adverse effects on coastal areas: in some cases such accidents can have a greater consequence for the people ashore than for those on board. The energy released if a modern gas-carrying vessel were to explode through collision or stranding would be equal to that of a nuclear weapon and it is the intention of the COST Project to endeavour to put a halt to the increase in marine accidents due to alleged falling standards by providing positive assistance to ships operating in specific European areas by advising on how Vessel Traffic Systems can be set up.

The COST project, as I understand it, intends to extend its advice to include our ports and rivers and, during the coming decade, various economic and technical developments will fundamentally change maritime traffic operations. The necessity for, and the possibilities now available for control of shipping, will increase in leaps and bounds and eventually will closely resemble the air traffic control systems and will affect ships underway in congested areas, port approaches, port areas, even the final docking of the vessel.

At Bremen this year the opinion was strongly voiced that VTS should be restricted to an advisory and informational role and that the final command decision must always remain on board each vessel. There is no doubt of an inescapable overlapping of interests between the VTS control and the role of a local pilot, as recently illustrated in connection with the Dutch Pilots. It cannot be in the interests of general maritime safety for a ship to follow executive orders from persons ashore with doubtful ability, experience and knowledge of local pilotage.

Pilots must be prepared to extend their duties to such shore stations, to become involved and to be responsible for that part of the VTS organisation which actually handles the direction and movement of shipping. In the general interest of safety as well as for the future of the pilotage profession local pilots must go out of their way to play an active role in the development of any VTS operation being set up in their district and in ensuring that any advice given over the VHF will be from a licensed pilot to a licensed pilot.

**Mr Walker** (*London Sea N*) seconding, referred to the application of misguided advice that more control gives more safety. Advice must not become autocratic control — the control and ultimate decision must rest with the ship.

**Mr Hooper** (*S'ot'on & IOW*) referred to the EMPA report and the work of EEC pilots (four of whom were present in Conference) in setting up regulations and in their implementation. The responsibility, together with the decision-making, rests on the bridge and "trade amateurs" must not be allowed to assume authority. Several other members spoke in strong support, including **Mr Campbell** (*Humber*) who added that pilots on prolonged shore duty lose touch and in the Humber they are required after nine months to return to pilotage from shore duty. **Mr Mann** (*London Sea S*) added that licensed air traffic controllers were not licensed pilots but, amongst other qualities were selected for unruffability — there was a need to train pilots for VTS duties. In addition, we need to ensure that pilots on VTS duty are backed by authority; qualifications alone are insufficient. **Mr Butler** (*Europilots*) recommended seeing all the VTS systems in European waters and suggested that the best system in Europe was that of West Germany and that was wholly operated by pilots.



Mr Gordon (*London Sea S*) proposed an amendment —

*THAT where in a pilotage district any Vessel Traffic Services scheme is intended to be implemented, and should there be any attempt to change the present law, namely section 30 sub-section 5 of the Pilotage Act 1913, licensed pilots from the district in question shall be responsible for this operation.*

The amended Resolution was seconded by Mr Hughes (*London Sea S*) and Mr Wilkin gave his full support. The Amended Resolution was carried with only one vote against in Joint Meeting and reaffirmed in the UKPA meeting *nem con*.

#### European Maritime Pilots' Association

#### RECOMMENDATION: VESSEL TRAFFIC SCHEMES

The basic policy of EMPA, as stated on many occasions (paper Captain Walker, VTS Resolution of the Technical Committee, AGM Madrid) is and must remain that where ports or districts institute VTS, pilots should be involved at the inception and regulate the operation of any such system.

If this aim cannot be achieved, active pilots should be involved in its operation at least when the safety of the ships and of the pilots is endangered, for instance during the periods of bad visibility (fog). If the operating authorities do not agree with these minimum standards, then EMPA-pilots should adopt a quite passive attitude towards these new navigational aids, hence it is proved that the willingness of the harbour or pilotage authorities to keep at all price the pilots out of the management of the VTS is clearly intended as a first step towards active traffic control or even towards remote pilotage.

*Capt De Baets  
Antwerp, August 1978.*

#### 3. From: The Executive

*THAT the meeting of the Humber Pilot Society urges the UKPA and Marine Branch of the T & GWU Joint Executive to take selective action in various UK pilotage districts against shipping interests which are manipulating the Merchant Shipping Act 1979 to the detriment of safety and the environment in the rivers and estuaries of the UK when the sole purpose of the 1979 Act was to secure by means of pilotage the safety of navigation in ports off and waters of the coast of the UK.*

In proposing the Resolution Mr Wilkin said it had been carried unanimously by 140 pilots at an Extraordinary Meeting of the Humber Pilots Society held on 30th July 1981 to discuss what action could be taken to stop what was obvious to the pilots, the shipowners manipulating the Department of Trade, the Pilotage Commission and the Pilotage Authorities in order to obtain pilotage certificates for foreign nationals without adequate safeguards to the Humber Pilots' livelihood.

The meeting was also attended by the General Secretary of the UKPA, some members of the Joint Executive and pilot observers from Liverpool, Manchester, Tyne, Tees, Southampton and London in an attempt to draw national attention to the unsatisfactory affairs which had been allowed to develop in pilotage in the United Kingdom.

Whatever happened to the fair treatment of pilots? Mr Wilkin recalled the report to Peter Shaw, the Secretary of State, in 1974, when the Chairman of SCOP reported to him amongst other things, "we wish to record our admiration of the pilots who give such high standards of service in all weathers; that we are recommending change does not imply that their personal service leaves something to be desired, rather we are aiming to set up legislative and organisational frameworks to give them effective support". Fine words indeed, but what has actually happened since the Merchant Shipping Act received the Royal Assent on the 4th April 1979? We have seen a Government fall, a complete change in the administration of the Marine Division Department of Trade, a complete change in the administration of the GCBS, we have had three Parliamentary under-Secretaries of State — Norman Tebbit, Lord Trefgarne and now Ian Sproat. Each new

minister has had to be given time to adjust to his new department and each brought a different approach to the problem and their own interpretation on how the new legislation should proceed. Members of the Joint Executive have on three separate occasions seen these three different Ministers to ensure that each new Minister understood the pilots' real concern for the future of their profession and to ensure safety standards are maintained. On each occasion they have come away from these meetings with mixed feelings.

We have ended up with a Pilotage Commission spending its time in discussion to resolve and produce acceptable solutions to the many problems which have been brought about by the amendments to the 1913 Pilotage Act but they are only able to offer advice to the Secretary of State who, as we have all seen, has decided "not to reach conclusions until the public reaction is known". One Secretary of State made it known that there would have to be serious compelling reasons for him not to accept the Commission's advice, but at the same time this Minister has told the Commission that he expects them to produce advice on the London District before any progress will be made with any other pilotage district and he will not be prepared to endorse bye-laws for London or any other port which would have the effect of adding significantly to the financial burdens of the United Kingdom coastal and near continental shipping and, until such times as the London District problems are resolved no progress will be made with any other pilotage district.

I believe that the serious compelling reasons which have persuaded the minister not to reach a decision were in fact the result of a very powerful lobby by the Passenger Ship Association and the GCBS who, by using vague half truths and suing for damages in High Court Actions have frightened pilotage authorities and the Department of Trade which has now effectively held up these re-organisational bye-laws of all pilotage districts, which bye-laws, when published, would have given pilots the opportunity to hear their objectors and have made them come out into the open.

In the case of the Humber, the pilots have had their own By-laws before the Department of Trade for the last 18 months, by using section 18 of the Pilotage Act. The By-laws, if promoted, would have limited the size of a ship which could be granted a pilotage certificate as the Amended Act allowed for, but the shipowner, by cleverly manipulating the 1913 Pilotage Act together with the Treaty of Rome, has managed to force the Department of Trade to issue orders to the Humber Pilotage Authority that they must examine and issue pilotage certificates to foreign nationals. This they have done, in spite of the so-called protection of Section 10 which was placed on the Humber, and our application of Section 10(2) to have the certificates revoked by the Minister was not upheld, which indicates that this part of the protection for pilots, which was given so much time during the Standing Committee debates in Parliament to ensure protection for pilots, has proved to be totally ineffective and meaningless. This should be seen by all pilots as a serious breakthrough by the shipowner who will not hesitate to use the same tactics in other districts when the opportunity arises.

Since the publication of the SCOP and ACOP Reports, and whether we as pilots agree with them or not, we must recognise that the pilots who sat on these committees managed to convince the committees to agree to have many safeguards built into the report to protect the pilots when the pilotage law has changed. I believe that the shipowner realised this and has since become highly organised to enable him to redress the balance, and to some extent they appear to have succeeded.

This resolution, which calls upon the Joint Executive to support the Humber Pilots in their request for selective action, to combat the activities of shipping interests who are attempting to thwart the objects of the 1979 Merchant Shipping Act, has the full support of the Joint Executive and has already resulted in the establishment of a Pilots' Action Group who are issuing Information Sheets to every MP, and to other interested parties. These are to inform them of the lack of proper implementation of the Merchant Shipping Act because of pressures on the Department of Trade by shipowners who, now having achieved the extension of pilotage certificates to foreign nationals, are reneging on the compulsory pilotage, compensation, etc.

If this resolution is carried by conference the shipowner will know that the pilots are united and prepared once again to stand up for their rights as they did so successfully at Birmingham in 1971. I have heard from various pilots and from the floor of this conference that some stations do not think that the Joint Executive is strong enough or is not doing sufficient to combat the shipowner, well let me say here and now that never

before in the history of the UKPA has so much work been carried out by each and every member of the Joint Executive, but we are only as good and as strong as our support from the membership.

The seconder was **Mr Broom** (*Manchester*) who emphasised that the Resolution could in no way be regarded as specific to the Humber but was equally relevant to all districts. It arose from what is seen as a national policy of the GCBS which in turn, if not encouraged, is certainly not discouraged by the Department of Trade.

He went on to say that in his opinion all local deals would fail in the long term when struck with a body which sees each local deal as a stepping stone toward the final national solution: a solution which may not sound the death knell of our profession but would certainly result more favourably to the GCBS than would otherwise be the case.

We are fixed with two matters, firstly a Merchant Shipping act which is in itself the result of compromise between two principals — ourselves and the GCBS — the implementation of which is dependant on the goodwill of the pilots and the GCBS, on the advice of the Pilotage Commission, and on that advice being interpreted correctly by the Department for presentation and recommendation to the Minister. We are also faced with the National Agreement which, again, mainly depends on the goodwill of ourselves and the GCBS to implement; but of which some of the main parts are interlinked with the Merchant Shipping Act and require either the approval of, or the advice of, the Pilotage Commission, and so back we come to the quality of interpretation and integrity of the recommendations made to the Minister by his Civil Servants because, generally speaking, we can have no quarrel with the quality or integrity of the advice emanating from the Pilotage Commission.

Both the Merchant Shipping Act and the National Agreement are the result of compromise and we have honoured both. The GCBS have not and in so doing they have exercised their influence on the Department to such an extent that we have no alternative but to question the integrity of those responsible.

Amongst others who entered the debate, **Mr Toff** (*Liverpool*) asked that the Minister be requested to get his Department to look at SCOP, ACOP and the Guidance Notes. These were not all in our favour but their acknowledgement would be regarded as a token of fair play. If "action" became necessary it should only be national, not selective.

**Mr Sidley** (*London River*) said it was sad when pilotage comes to such a low ebb. Pilots were not a group of militants just pushing forward ideas and views of their own, they were representing the safety and commercial wellbeing of their several districts. Action expected from Government and others had not been forthcoming. Pilots had a great tradition of service to ships; "never be late" may seem to be in conflict with some port authorities who appear to be uncommercial. When morale goes down because agreements are consistently not adhered to we would be sorry to see things go downhill and become degraded. Pilots are slow to anger, but it is welling up.

What is wanted is a decision by the Minister. We do not expect all to be in our favour but it would at least stop years of indecision. Before using the ultimate let us use all other methods of persuasion available, let us approach the Minister and plead with the Minister.

**Mr Sidgwick** (*Tees*) was of the opinion that the Civil Service was standing between pilots and the Minister. Safety, he said, was always a costly preventative, yet its absence could lead to vastly greater cost and misery. Tees, a non-compulsory port, was subject to delay in the implementation of the Pilotage Commission's recommendation for compulsory pilotage, a reprehensible form of economy. Of the vessels using Teesport, 80% were gas and oil tankers.

**Mr Holmes** (*S'ot'on & IOW*) supported Messrs Evans and Sidley in asking for a stay of execution. The Minister had not only honoured the Conference with his presence but had clearly taken a great interest in pilotage. It would be well to give him an opportunity to look into the situation and to speed up the process begun so many years ago.

In conclusion, **Mr Wilkin** said there would be no question of picking a district that was in trouble. The Resolution would only be called into use with great caution and not without first approaching the Minister.

The Resolution was carried with only seven votes against in Joint Meeting and reaffirmed in the UKPA meeting with only two votes against.

#### 4. From: **Europilots (Full-time deep sea pilots)**

*THAT the United Kingdom Pilots' Association and all members undertaking normal acts of deep sea pilotage shall agree and implement one common tariff.*

Opening as proposer, **Mr Butler** (*Europilots*) said Deep Sea Pilotage was a jungle, decades if not a century behind in its organisation compared with most ports. It extends to the North Cape and Leningrad with 70 or so full-time Deep Sea Pilots. Almost every government, pilotage authority, IMCO and the EEC have proliferated recommendations and legislation within the past six years. There was nothing unique in that pilotage earnings were a major problem — indeed an emotive subject, vying with pilot ladders as a subject of conversation between pilots.

The EEC Department of Transport recommended to us in 1979 their support for a single tariff within Europe and they felt that the pilots should be free of the need to fight over differing rates in order to obtain a living (at that time there were more than five in the UK and with two in our own Association). There is no evidence that the owners support the idea of a single tariff.

After some years of endeavour within the UK, a single rate has largely been achieved and is in use with our agents and owners. Uniformity was achieved at the lowest common denominator (less than £1 per hour for 24hr attendance) and, in 1980, the rates were substantially increased, only to be undercut by the Dutch with a considerable loss of work. This was resolved by our having to freeze our rates for two years. We hope we may look forward to an increase in January 1982: the amount the owner will pay overall has been lost in the decline in the value of the pound whilst Deep Sea pilots are not covered by the NMB Awards.

The purpose of this Resolution arises from recent negotiations between the owners and a group of fellow members of this Association. The owners now have another tariff before them which undercuts that of the full-time pilots who are engaged solely on deep sea work for a living, their only source of income.

The aim is not to eliminate from Deep Sea pilotage those members who have, in addition to a district licence, a deep sea certificate and who use them both in and out of some UK ports. If a tariff is pitched lower to attract the business to and from these ports then so be it for the present, but there can be no reason why we should not have one standard rate, *ie* one similar to that used by the full time deep sea pilots based on mileage with a draft and tonnage surcharge. There should be no favours to owners for vessels bound to or from certain ports — no favours or discounts in any form: the inevitable result is to pit one pilot against another. Experience shows that once such favour has been given it will be asked for again and again and quoted against legitimate negotiations or agreed rates.

We need to compete against the Dutch, the Germans, the Belgians, the French and we need to compete against British personnel who work for Dutch and Belgian organisations, some of whom use *nommes de plume*. The question rests on whether this Association supports the action of members who are offering a lower tariff than that used by other members in order to augment their earnings.

**Mr May** (*Europilots*) seconded the Resolution, adding that not only is our tariff different from that of EEC countries but there is competition from East German and Russian pilots on traffic going to the Baltic.

After some further discussion the Resolution was carried *nem con*.

### 5. From: London Sea Pilots (South)

*THAT this Conference believes that the Constitution and Rules of this Association are out-moded and archaic bearing in mind the present and proposed state of pilotage in the United Kingdom.*

**Mr Godden** (*London Sea S*), proposing, said the Resolution was not aimed at producing a new set of instant working rules but to bring the procedures of the UKPA, which had served well for the past century, more into line with the requirements of the present and the second century as well as to enhance the stature of the UKPA.

Communication, he felt, was inadequate: the use of circular letters for all matters, significant or trivial, left much to be desired; the titles of the various officers reflected little of their true function (*eg* Senior vice-President was a title that suggested the real leader was unable to be present — the office performed was that of Chairman); the General Secretary and Legal Adviser had wide ranging responsibilities including many matters which might be seen as more appropriately in the domain of our new Treasurer. He had nothing but praise for the sustained efforts of Edgar Eden and his ability to cope with the hotchpotch of legislation and argument that pilotage engenders today, yet he and his admirable assistant Yvonne Blake were only employed by UKPA on a part-service basis: however benign the present co-partner, will UKPA always wish to have a shared secretariat?

He suggested that, in the new UKPA, those elected to the Executive should give up most local offices and that the Chairman should be practically full-time, instantly available to stations, members and the media whilst doing only that amount of pilotage which is necessary to maintain his expertise and his licence: he should be seen to be the leader of the whole organisation and have no parochial axe to grind: he should serve for a period of three years and then be up for compulsory re-election: he should somehow be reimbursed with sufficient funds to maintain a balance with the full pilotage fees his station normally earns.

It was important that the membership saw good reasons, not only insurance, why they should belong to UKPA.

The Resolution was seconded by **Mr Mann** (*London Sea S*) who was reluctant to change any of the Constitutions but whilst admiring the achievements of the Executive he was critical of its secrecy. Some stations did show apathy about UKPA but this was due entirely to ignorance of what it was doing. More needs to be made known of the role of UKPA members on the Pilotage Commission, the PNPf and in negotiations with pay and Letch.

After some further comments from the floor, the Chairman said he accepted all that Mr Godden had said and, if this could be set out more fully in writing, it would be fully considered by the Joint Executive. The Resolution was then put to the vote and **carried** with one vote against.

### 6. From: Milford Haven

*THAT this Conference, bearing in mind not only UKPA policy but also present efforts of the Pilots' Action Group, request the Executive to give serious consideration to seeking the advice and expertise of a competent Public Relations consultant or firm to assist the Action Group in their efforts.*

**Mr Leney** (*Milford Haven*), proposing, said the present circumstances which gave rise to the formation of an Action Group underlined the need for putting the facts of the case forward in matters of pilotage, so as to augment the actions of the Executive in informing the public and influential bodies.

**Mr Carling** (*TOW*) seconded the Resolution, saying that all present had been impressed by Mr Sproat's visit yesterday and believed that matters would now move more quickly. At the same time the small ship owners will fight more strongly still and there was a need to pursue the Resolution.

He quoted the IOW which had been quietly active in PR for the last eighteen months and had discussed the new Merchant Shipping Act with their local authority — progress had been very satisfactory until they encountered the representative of Furness Withy, who had no knowledge of the facility for Masters of small ships to obtain a certificate. The small ship-owners seemed very vociferous within GCBS concerning the potential cost of the new Act — they fear they may have to pay more to the Master if he gets a certificate.

**Mr Barwick** (*London River*) said whilst PR was important in all businesses, his station doubted if they could afford a PR firm. There was indeed difficulty in getting prominent coverage for the good material we could put on paper within our own resources. Consequently, he suggested our retaining a good class journalist with good connections and went on to propose an AMENDMENT by adding to the middle of the penultimate line —

*"consultant or firm, or we retain the services of a professional journalist, to assist the Action Group in their efforts".*

After some further discussion, the Amendment was **carried** by 49 votes to 20, in which proxies were included.

### 7. London Sea Pilots (South)

*THAT this Conference takes note of the fact that shortly there will be Pilots surplus to requirements nationally. To ensure that this is remedied in a fair manner, the Executive is urged to demand that the Management Committee of the Pilots' National Pension Fund introduce rules to enable Pilots to retire early on an equitable pension, either by bringing forward the doubling up years or by abolishing them and lowering the pension denominator. Each Pilot to have the option of remaining under present terms or retiring under these new Rules.*

**Mr Congdon** (*London Sea S*) proposed the Resolution and recalled the question he had posed in the pensions discussion, that the doubling up years need funding to avoid penalising the very men, over 60, it is hoped to help.

**Mr Hughes** (*London Sea S*), seconding, pointed to the optional aspect of the last sentence — it was merely a basic request for fairness that would apply to only a few members. The 1979 Act, and new members, will produce more surplus yet at least one GCBS member of an Authority was known to have instructions to stop anything that could cause even a fractional rate increase. Nothing could compel a pilot to hand in his licence and therefore redundancy considerations are not applicable.

A half-pay system, he said, was not acceptable because a reduced pension was the consequence. This precluded the early retirement of the older men. The principle affected the future, including the age profile on stations, leading to a pilot service overmanned but underpaid with many elderly and a big age gap.

Several further points for and against the Resolution were made and Mr Congden, before the vote, suggested each pilot would do well to check his own accounts and find out how much he had paid into the pension fund and judge for himself if he had a deal that was competitive in the present-day pension market.

The vote was overwhelmingly **against** the Resolution, there being a total of only eleven votes in favour.

## Miss Yvonne Blake

Several observations from the delegates reflected their sympathy with the Secretary, Yvonne Blake, who was recovering from an operation, and their regard for the work she did for pilots and pilotage. At the opening of the Joint Meeting, on Wednesday afternoon, the Conference made a formal expression of appreciation and best wishes for good recovery and an early return to her invaluable participation in pilots' affairs.



## DELEGATES & OBSERVERS ATTENDING JOINT CONFERENCE

ABERDEEN	A F L Esson	LONDON SEA (SOUTH)	J Congdon, D W Davis, J D Godden, C M Hughes, D James, P Lloyd-Jones, R L Mann
BELFAST	N C E McKinney, R J Madden		
BLYTH	R R Fawcett	LONDON SEA (NORTH)	D Goswell, R McLaren, L Sutherland, N Walker, R Williams, A Vaughan
BOSTON	P M Brown		
BRISTOL	G Moodie, T J Russell, S E Vowles	LONDON SEA (WEST)	D D Hall, P A Levack, M McDonald, D McLean, A J Moore, J Morton, R R Rowlinson, J Sanderson
CLYDE	W Brown, G C Howison, M B Perry		
DUNDEE	W F Craig		
EUROPILOTS	R B Bradbury, R S Butler, J Dixon, G R May	LONDON (RIVER)	A Atkin, M Barwick, P Carden, D I McMillan, R Sidley
FALMOUTH	G B Kent, P J Langdon, W B Ross	LIVERPOOL	J Brown, R A Glover, N S Owen, P J H Tebay, G A Topp, J Webben, R F Youde
FORTH	I Barclay, D Berry, J Collister, W Gardiner, W Kitching, T Roberts J Rutherford	MANCHESTER	C M Broon, D R Brown, R Cashin, B Edwards, M Frith, J T Wainright
GLOUCESTER	R H Morgan, B H Richards	MILFORD HAVEN	I Berry, B I Evans, J M Leney, D MacArthur, P Ryder
GOOLE	A Hoggarth, R Shaw		
GREAT YARMOUTH	G M Logie, R L Wright	POOLE	P W Colville
HUMBER	F Berry, R B Campbell, R Carmichael, P A Church, J C Hall, A J Herbert, D A Hunter, D H Moulson, T D Mulholland, P J Mullett, A Redfern, M R Walker, K E Ward, C C Wilkin, T P Yates	PORT TALBOT	J Parry
		SOUTH EAST WALES	J Bennett, M L Doyle, K Lewis, K A Sinclair, P G Watt, E J Williams
		SOUTHAMPTON & ISLE OF WIGHT	P R Carling, P G Driver, K Grant, G E V Holmes, M H C Hooper, J D B J D B Wylie
IPSWICH	D A Ingham	SULLOM, VOE	P J Healy
LONDON (MEDWAY)	W C Cuthill, S M Hunter, H J Marshman, C A Rhodes	SUNDERLAND	P H Lee
		SWANSEA	A N Anderson, J E Evans

TEES	G C Blackler, G A Coates, D S Hellier, L Hill, A H Innes, P B Johnson, A S Lithgo, D T Parker, L Sidgwick	TRENT	A B Hooley, C J Hunt, C B Middleton, R Thompson
		TYNE	J Burn, E A C Cowell, J A Hogg, J R Phillips

### UKPA GROUP PERMANENT HEALTH INSURANCE SCHEME

In accordance with the automatic review system, which is linked to 30% of median Letch earnings, the current weekly benefit will be increased from £56.54 to £65.87 on 1st January 1982 at a quarterly premium of £14. Before renewal date, the Executive Committee will obtain District views on the adequacy of this rate of benefit.

### UKPA GROUP PERSONAL ACCIDENT INSURANCE SCHEME

The benefit of £27,500 in respect of accidental death, loss of one or more limbs or eyes and permanent disablement including loss of licence due to accidental bodily injury, has not been significantly altered since 1977. It may seem desirable to take action to maintain the real purchasing power of the benefit insured. The present quarterly premium is £5.50, while, for revised premiums of £7 or £8, benefit of £35000 or £40000 would be secured. Delegates are requested to obtain the views of their members as to the future level of benefit required so that any alteration could become effective from 1st January, 1982.

### UKPA LEGAL EXPENSES POLICY

DAS currently provide cover of £25000 at a quarterly premium of 65p per member. The Executive committee now consider it prudent to increase cover to £50000 at a premium of 80p. Furthermore, consideration is being taken of the need to indemnify members in respect of the legal costs of any appeal from the decisions of the Pilotage Commission under the compensatory sections of the Merchant Shipping Act 1979.

GAC  
October 1981

### Receptions

On the evening of Tuesday, 24th November, the General Council of British Shipping and the British Ports Association gave a Reception at which the UKPA Executive and other guests were welcomed.

On the next evening the UKPA and MPB Reception was held at the Piccadilly Hotel. Among those who were present were Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal; Mr Iain Sproat, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Department of Trade; Members of Parliament; representatives from the Department of Trade and Industry and other Government Departments; General Council of British Shipping; Trinity House and other Pilotage Authorities; Members of the Advisory Committee on Pilotage, Honourable Company of Master Mariners, British Ports Association, International Maritime Pilots' Association, and the many other organisations with which the UKPA has worked over the year.

## Local Secretaries

Aberdeen ... ..	A. F. L. Esson ... ..	Aberdeen Harbour Pilots, North Pier, Aberdeen
Barrow-in-Furness ... ..	A. MacDonald ... ..	10 Infield Gardens, Barrow-in-Furness, Cumbria
Belfast ... ..	N. C. E. McKinney ... ..	8 Alt-Min Avenue, Belfast 8, N. Ireland
Blyth ... ..	M. K. Purvis ... ..	4 St. Romans Drive, Seaton Sluice, Whitley Bay, Tyne and Wear
Brixham ... ..	R. J. Curtis ... ..	"Abrigo" 20 Furzeham Park, Brixham, Devon
Clyde ... ..	W. Brown ... ..	"Pentland" 66 Belmont Road, Kilmacolm, Renfrewshire
Coleraine ... ..	W. Dalzell ... ..	Harbour Office, Coleraine, Co. Derry, N. Ireland
Dundee ... ..	G. Dobbie ... ..	16 Buddon Drive, Monifieth, Dundee, Tayside
Exeter ... ..	B. L. Rowsell ... ..	17 Camperdown Terrace, Exmouth, Devon
Falmouth ... ..	Mrs. V. W. Telling ... ..	14 Arwenack Street, Falmouth, Cornwall
Fleetwood ... ..	R. D. Pratt ... ..	16 Thirlmere Avenue, Fleetwood, Lancs.
Fowey ... ..	M. H. Randolph ... ..	Moorlands Farm, Treemill, Tywardreath, Par, Cornwall
Gloucester ... ..	B. H. Richards ... ..	Southerly, 60 Combe Avenue, Portishead, Nr. Bristol, BS20 9J5
Goole ... ..	R. Shaw ... ..	54 Mill Beck Lane, Cottingham, North Humberside
Grangemouth ... ..	W. C. Gardner ... ..	6 Parkhead Road, Linlithgow, West Lothian
Hartlepool ... ..	B. G. Spaldin ... ..	24 Kesteven Road, Fens Estate, West Hartlepool
Hull ... ..	P. Church ... ..	58 Westminster Drive, Grimsby, South Humberside
Inverness ... ..	H. Patience ... ..	"Altmore" 2 Glenburn Drive, Inverness IV2 2ND
Ipswich ... ..	D. A. Ingham ... ..	Ipswich Pilotage Office, Dock Head, Ipswich, Suffolk IP3 0DP
Lancaster ... ..	H. Gardner ... ..	Greystones, 128 Morecambe Road, Lancaster
Leith ... ..	R. Hay ... ..	39 Christiemiller Avenue, Craigentinny, Edinburgh
London:		
Sea Pilots South ... ..	R. L. Mann ... ..	7 Springfield Road, Cliftonville, Margate, Kent
Sea Pilots West ... ..	M. J. G. McDonald ... ..	Turks Hill, Taylors Lane, Higham, Nr. Rochester, Kent
River ... ..	P. A. Carden ... ..	The Old Rectory, 91 Windmill St, Gravesend, Kent
Medway ... ..	T. G. Hannaford ... ..	175 Wards Hill Road, Minster, Sheppey, Kent
Sea Pilots North ... ..	R. M. Dick ... ..	24 Seafield Road, Dovercourt, Essex
Londonderry ... ..	C. J. McCann ... ..	Shrove, Greencastle, Co. Donegal, Ireland
Lowestoft ... ..	W. Craig ... ..	57 Royal Avenue, Lowestoft, Suffolk
Milford Haven ... ..	B. I. Evans ... ..	Rock Cottage, Wellington Gardens, Hakin, Milford Haven, Dyfed
Montrose ... ..	A. G. Brown ... ..	6 Panmarc Terrace, Montrose, Angus DD10 8HD
Neath ... ..	A. Boshier ... ..	24 Thorney Road, Baglan, Port Talbot, Glam.
Orkney ... ..	W. Cowie ... ..	7 Faraclett, Kirkwall, Orkney KW15 1XD
Peterhead ... ..	D. J. MacKinnon ... ..	1 Acacia Grove, Peterhead, Aberdeenshire
Plymouth ... ..	J. A. McLean ... ..	Pilot Office, 2 The Barbican, Plymouth, Devon
Poole ... ..	P. Colville ... ..	7 Gorse Road, Corfe Mullen, Nr. Wimbourne, Dorset
Port Talbot ... ..	J. Parry ... ..	6 Hazel Close, Dan-y-Graig, Porthcawl, Glam.
Portrush ... ..	T. Doherty ... ..	16 Crocnamack Square, Portrush, Co. Antrim, N. Ireland
Preston ... ..	M. Purvis ... ..	Pilotage Office, The Docks, Preston, Lancs.
Prestatyn ... ..	A. M. Hutton ... ..	The Orchard, 8 Stoneby Drive, Prestatyn, Clwyd LL19 9PE
Shetland ... ..	B. J. L. Cheevers ... ..	3 Burgadale, Brae, Shetland
Shoreham ... ..	E. Wray ... ..	Shoreham Pilotage Service, Watch House, Beach Road, Portslade, Brighton, Sussex
Southampton, Isle of	P. R. Carling ... ..	Pilot Office, Berth 37, Eastern Docks, Southampton, SO1 1AG
Wight and Portsmouth		
South East Wales ... ..	E. F. Williams ... ..	39 Arles Road, Ely, Cardiff, CF5 5AN
Sunderland ... ..	J. Patterson ... ..	c/o Sunderland Pilot Office, Old North Pier, Roker, Sunderland, Co. Durham
Teignmouth ... ..	S. C. Hook ... ..	7 Ivy Lane, Teignmouth, Devon
Tees ... ..	D. T. Parker ... ..	"Stonehenge", The Green, Low Worsall, Yarm, Cleveland TS15 9PJ
Trent ... ..	C. J. Hunt ... ..	2 Spinney Walk, Anlaby Park, Hull, HU4 6XG
Tyne ... ..	J. R. Phillips ... ..	6 Mowbray Road, North Shields, Tyne and Wear
Watchet ... ..	N. P. Stokes ... ..	2 Cottiford, Bicknoller, Nr. Taunton, Somerset TA4 4LR
Weymouth ... ..	B. E. Caddy ... ..	15 Hope Street, Weymouth, Dorset, DT4 8TU
Wisbech ... ..	D. Locke ... ..	Adderley House, Burrett Road, Walsoken, Wisbech Cambs.
Workington ... ..	M. Ditchburn ... ..	68 Loop Road North, Whitehaven, Cumberland
Yarmouth ... ..	R. Wright ... ..	Pilot Station, Riverside Road, Gorleston-on-Sea, Norfolk NR31 6P2
Europilots ... ..	R. B. Bradbury ... ..	18 Silverthorne Drive, Southport, Lancs PR9 9PF