

The Pilot

(OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS' ASSOCIATION)

No. 3. Vol. 23

November, 1943

IN THIS ISSUE

FULL REPORT OF THE 57th CONFERENCE

at the

HOLBORN RESTAURANT, LONDON

SEPTEMBER 29th & 30th, 1943

POST WAR PILOTAGE:

Replies to the Ministry's Four Points

U.K.P.A. AND OFFICERS' FEDERATION.

Branches asked to give their views on Affiliation
Question

Head Office of the Association:

No. 13, SMALL STREET, BRISTOL

Sir JOHN H. INSKIP, K.B.E., Solicitor and General Secretary
to whom all communications are to be addressed

OFFICERS FOR
1943-1944 of the

United Kingdom Pilots' Association

Honorary Vice-Presidents :

VISCOUNT CALDECOTE	LORD STRABOLGI
LORD DULVERTON	SIR IRVING ALBERY, M.P.
LADY APSLEY, M.P.	MAJOR JAMES BURNIE
HARRY DAVIS, Esq.	CAPTAIN DANIEL E. RANKIN
JOHN LEWIS, Esq. (Swansea)	CAPTAIN J. S. LEARMONT
W. T. SMALL, Esq.	CAPTAIN W. H. COOMBS

Vice-Presidents :

MR. BERNARD C. WEBB (Lamlash)
MR. J. H. A. SMITH (Isle of Wight Outward)

Trustees :

MR. T. STOODLEY (Cardiff) MR. W. T. SMALL (Liverpool)
MR. GEORGE N. RICHARDSON, O.B.E. (Humber)

Executive Committee :

MR. J. STANLEY AYRE (Tyne)	MR. H. B. EAGLE (Isle of Wight Outward)
MR. J. J. JONES (Cardiff)	MR. ALEXANDER A. LOVE (Glasgow)
MR. F. S. CHESTERFIELD (Humber)	MR. G. W. WINDASS (London River)
MR. M. M. MARSHALL (Tyne)	MR. F. R. E. GOLDSMITH (Gravesend Channel)
	MR. C. E. MOCK (Swansea)

Finance :

MESSRS. WEBB (Chairman), JONES AND SMITH

Auditors :

MESSRS. WATLING, PARKER AND CO. (Bristol)

General Secretary and Solicitor :

SIR JOHN H. INSKIP, K.B.E., 13, Small Street, Bristol

Editor of "The Pilot" :

ALFRED CURTHOYS
Africa House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2

United Kingdom Pilots' Association

REPORT OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH CONFERENCE

Held in London, September 29th and 30th, 1943

TWO subjects made this Conference an outstanding one in the history of the Association, post-war pilotage and a proposal that the pilots should associate themselves with the Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation Ltd. Both provoked lengthy discussions.

In the twelve months since the first war Conference turned over in its mind some aspects of pilotage and tried to visualise the shape of things to come after the war there has been a growing consciousness that important changes might be proposed. Whereas in 1942 it was all rather nebulous, this time Conference had the advantage of being able to focus its attention on four specific points which the Ministry of War Transport had commended to the consideration not only of the pilots but also the shipowners, Trinity House and Port Authorities. Conference treated the four points as definite questions and resolutions giving the Association's answers to three of them were passed :

1. General Compulsory Pilotage strongly supported
2. Central Authority not desired ; pilots not to become employees of any body, local or central
3. Sickness Benefit and Pensions. Every port should have an adequate fund.

The fourth point related to the ownership of pilot boats and the Conference decided that this was essentially a matter for decision between the pilots of each port and their Authority.

General compulsory pilotage cropped up at other stages in the proceedings and during a discussion on a London River resolution, Mr. Webb gave the assurance that the subject which has " always been one of the planks of the Association " would be kept to the front.

There were two resolutions on the agenda, one from Swansea, the other from Falmouth, which by different methods had the common aim of seeking greater strength for the Association by entering into alliance with other organisations of seafarers. The two ports readily accepted a suggestion combining the two resolutions and the issue became that of whether the U.K.P.A. should affiliate with the Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation Ltd.

Before that stage was reached, however, the pilots met Capt. W. H. Coombs, President of the Federation, who at the invitation of the Executive Committee came along to luncheon on the first day. He was no stranger among them having in the past been their guest at Conference dinners. He addressed Conference in the afternoon on the work of the Federation and answered numerous points raised by the delegates. There followed a debate on whether the Association was strong enough to achieve its ends by independent action or needed the help which the Federation might secure. Opinion was almost equally divided so it was decided to ask all the ports to give their opinion for the guidance of the Executive.

As usual the thoughtful survey of pilotage matters in the report made by Sir John Inskip was a feature of the Conference and provided abundant evidence not only of the constant watch kept on the pilots' interests but of effective action in many directions.

A resolution from Port Talbot asking for a better basis for the scale of pensions covering war risks gave rise to considerable discussion and Conference accepted the assurance from the Chair that all the points raised would be taken into consideration by the Executive.

Another subject was the internal organisation of the Association. A number of suggestions were made and an undertaking given that the Executive would go into the matter thoroughly.

The election of officers found a new colleague for Mr. Bernard Webb in the place of Mr. Richardson whose wartime duties prevent him from attending the Executive meetings. His inability to find the time was greatly regretted, because he has long been an outspoken and valuable member of the Executive, and always a loyal supporter of the Association.

The election of Mr. J. H. A. Smith to a vice-presidency gives a new honour to an old friend who has given the Association good service for many years on the Executive. Two newcomers to the Executive are Mr. Frank Goldsmith (Gravesend Channel) and Mr. C. E. Mock (Swansea) who made valuable contributions to the Conference debates.

It was decided to invite Lady Apsley, M.P. and Capt. Coombs to be hon. vice-presidents of the Association and they have since accepted. Incidentally, there is an item in this issue about Capt. Daniel Rankin of Penzance, who is probably the senior hon. vice-president. He celebrated his 86th birthday on October 13th and received the congratulations of the pilots.

Two meetings of the Executive Committee were held, one on the afternoon of September 28th when various matters relating to the Conference were discussed, and the other at the close of the Conference.

THE ROLL CALL

Mr. Bernard C. Webb presided at the Conference and there were present :

Executive Committee: Messrs. F. S. Chesterfield (Humber); H. B. Eagle (Isle of Wight Outward); J. J. Jones (Cardiff); Alexander A. Love (Glasgow); M. M. Marshall (Tyne); J. H. A. Smith (Isle of Wight Outward); J. A. Sparrow (Gravesend-Sea); G. W. Windass (London River).

Secretary and Solicitor: Sir John H. Inskip.

Delegates:

BARRY	Messrs. J. A. Clare and John P. Bennett
BLYTH	Mr. W. T. Carr
CARDIFF	Messrs. H. G. Pead, L. R. Slade and G. H. Taylor
CINQUE PORTS	Messrs. N. A. Line, W. A. F. Maltby and E. T. Day
DUNDEE	Mr. David Grafton
FALMOUTH	Mr. J. T. Watson
GLASGOW	Messrs. W. Fernie and S. Ritchie
GOUROCK	Messrs. H. S. Rogers and J. H. Innes
HARTLEPOOL	Mr. John R. Hastings
HARWICH	Messrs. J. J. Elven and Martin Davis
ISLE OF WIGHT (Inward)	Lt.-Comdr. L. W. Akerman
LLANELLY	Mr. William Hughes
LONDON CHANNEL	Messrs. F. R. E. Goldsmith, C. A. Papworth and W. J. Glassborow
LONDON RIVER	Messrs. C. Catton and A. Bray
NEATH	Mr. W. J. Jenkins
PLYMOUTH	Mr. W. Little
PORT TALBOT	Mr. H. A. Gunn
SHOREHAM	Mr. A. J. Blaker
SUNDERLAND	Messrs. R. Simpson and C. C. Donkin
SWANSEA	Messrs. D. J. Davies and C. E. Mock
TYNE	Messrs. A. Ayre, J. H. Burn, T. Hogg, Ed. Ramsay and R. Phillips

Visitors: Messrs. Edward J. Spurrier (Newport, Mon.) and Stanley C. Williams (London and Clyde).

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LORD APSLEY

Conference opened with a brief address of welcome from the Chairman who said he thought it would be one of the most vital, if not the most vital they had ever had. He referred to the losses they had suffered; there were many vacancies among them—old faces whose absence they deplored.

"But above all," he continued, "is the loss of our President. That is a loss we, as pilots, will never be able to replace. Lord Apsley was a man who went whole-heartedly into everything with faithfulness, friendliness and personal charm."

At Mr. Webb's invitation Conference stood for a few moments in silence as a mark of respect and in farewell.

Sir John H. Inskip then read his annual report.

Birthday Greetings to Capt. Daniel Rankin

For as long as *The Pilot* has been published the name of Capt. Daniel E. Rankin of Penzance has appeared among the Hon. Vice-Presidents. Capt. Coombs brought news of him to the Conference luncheon, by a strange coincidence having had a letter from him that morning.

On October 13th Capt. Rankin celebrated his 86th birthday. Mr. Bernard Webb sent him a letter of congratulation from the pilots and received a cordial reply from the veteran.

"He was and is one of the finest old gentlemen I have ever met," Mr. Webb told the Editor. "I might compare him in one way with Lord Apsley in that I cannot imagine either of them ever doing a dirty trick to anyone."

FIGURES PLEASE

Every port is invited to let the Secretary have as soon as possible, the latest figures of their earnings, with any comments which they care to make. They should send their net earnings for the year 1942 and up to the end of October, 1943.

PROBLEMS OF THE WAR AND THE COMING PEACE

"It is more than ever necessary for the Pilots to stand together"

By SIR JOHN H. INSKIP, K.B.E.

DURING the past twelve months since the last Conference there have been periodical meetings of the Executive Committee who have been giving their attention to an unusual number of problems, mostly, as might be expected, arising out of war conditions. These have been referred to in *The Pilot*, which has contained as usual a full report of the Executive Committee meetings.

It is not my intention to deal as fully as usual in this report with the variety of matters which have engaged the attention of the Executive Committee and of myself during the past twelve months, and I am, therefore, confining myself in the main to those matters which I judge to be of general interest to the whole body of pilots and to the difficulties which have arisen at various ports owing to the war.

Then I must say something about "Post War Problems" to pave the way for the deliberations which will follow.

Membership

First of all I must refer in my capacity as Secretary to the position in which the Association finds itself. Last year I remarked that the membership of the Association had kept up remarkably well after allowing for the breakaway of substantial numbers at Liverpool and Manchester. This year I am able to report an improvement. Enquiries have come from one or two of the smaller ports wishing to join, as well as from individual pilots at ports with less than 100 per cent membership, and I am sure that having regard to the reduced numbers of licensed pilots, the number of members is proportionately larger than it has been for a good many years.

Financial Position

The financial position reflects the healthy state of the Association, showing as it does in the last balance sheet investments valued at £7,353.13.9, and an income of over £1,750. We must look forward, I suppose, to increased expenditure and we are in a position financially to face the future with confidence.

Liverpool and Manchester

Before leaving this question, some reference may be expected from me with regard to Liverpool and Manchester. The pilots of these two ports, which still remain outside the Association, evidently feel that their own interests are better served by the Transport and General Workers' Union, but what contribution they or that union is making to the general well-being of the main body of pilots is another question altogether, and it can hardly be suggested that individual ports are

having an eye to the general welfare of pilots by going off independently and allying themselves to this or that organisation and so acting individually as may serve their own selfish interests, quite regardless of the common good.

As we face the "Post War Problems," it is more than ever necessary for the pilots to stand together and present a united front, which it is quite impossible to do with divided counsels. However, it is now some little time since the pilots of these ports took this backward step and there is no sign or likelihood, so far as I can see at present, of other ports following this unfortunate example.

The Right to Renewal of Licence

There have been one or two cases during the past twelve months of Pilotage Authorities refusing to renew pilots' licences, and possibly a re-statement of the position might be made in this report.

The Pilotage Act provides for the periodical renewing of a pilot's license, and a license once granted for a year or for any other period is, subject to any conditions imposed in the license, renewable as of right in the absence of any adequate cause for refusal to renew. This is really elementary, and incidentally it is one of the difficulties which the Pilotage Authority is up against when it finds, as has often happened under war conditions, that the trade of the port is not sufficient for the full employment of all the licensed pilots. A pilot has, of course, a right of appeal against a refusal by a Pilotage Authority to renew his license.

Income Tax Allowance

At some ports the pilots have recently been in difficulty with regard to their income tax allowance. The practice varies in different districts, but for the most part there is a fixed percentage allowance to cover expenses incurred by the pilots in the performance of their duties. The question put to me from more than one port has been as to the kind of expenditure which should be allowed and some reliance has been placed upon the fact that the Ministry of War Transport has granted certain concessions to dock labourers and such like. This is a matter with which the Inland Revenue are not directly concerned and there do not appear to be any concessions made by the Inland Revenue as regards expenses incurred by transferred workers, although there is a statutory provision for travelling allowances for persons who are assessable under schedule E. There is no source from which the pilots could obtain a grant similar to those made by the Ministry of War Transport to dock labourers, and such like, and the position is, therefore, as it

always has been, that each individual pilot must, in the absence of an agreed percentage deduction, make out his own case for an allowance.

Orders by F.O.I.Cs.

There does not appear to have been much trouble lately in reference to Navigation Orders made by Flag Officers in Charge. The last case I dealt with was again found to be one in which the order of the Flag Officer in Charge was *ultra vires*, and this class of case, of which there have been many during the war, emphasises the value of the safeguards provided for pilots by the Pilotage Act. In every case which has come to my notice, there was an attempted interference with the established rights of pilots by curtailing the district or altering the stages, but in the light of the experience provided by these cases, it seems unlikely that there will be any further trouble of a similar kind.

There is a good deal of talk just now of amending the Pilotage Act, and so I am going to mention in this report one or two matters which have cropped up during the past twelve months, calling for review when the time comes.

An Inadequate Payment

One of the sections in the Pilotage Act 1913 which will certainly call for amendment on any review of the Act is Section 34, which provides for an allowance to a licensed pilot when taken out of his district. It is a small matter but the point has been raised sufficiently often during the last year or two to call for a reference in this report. This clause of the Act provides that where a pilot is taken out of a district for which he is licensed or beyond the point for which he has been engaged, either without his consent or in unavoidable circumstances, he shall be entitled over and above his pilotage dues to maintenance and to the sum of 10/6d. a day. In most cases this is a completely inadequate payment, and rightly or wrongly some Pilotage Authorities have with the approval of the Ministry made a bye-law laying down a larger payment. In one recent case a ship owner refused to make the larger payment and he claimed that the statutory allowance of 10/6d. could not be exceeded, and he may very well have been right in this contention. Strangely enough, I have come across one case in which the only charge made has been the statutory one of 10/6d. and nothing for maintenance.

It may be that the statutory allowance is only to be paid in the absence of any other amount authorised by bye-law, but even so, the time has surely come for a substantial increase in the amount to be paid to a pilot who is kept from performing his duties against his will or in unavoidable circumstances. It is a small point, but not regarded so by a pilot who finds himself involved in circumstances of this kind and that is why I make this passing reference to it.

Work Outside the District

Another question for review when the time comes and which has never been really answered is with regard to the right of a pilot to make his own charge for work done outside his district, and also as to the liability to poundage on any fees paid for this outside work. I mention it now because the question is so frequently put to me, and it is clearly a point which must be kept in mind when the Pilotage Act comes under review.

At many ports the schedule of rates contains a charge for pilotage services between one port and another specifically named, and presumably there is power under the Pilotage Act for the making of these rates, although this right has been questioned. Section 17 of the Act empowers a Pilotage Authority "to fix for the district the rates of payment to be made in respect of the services of a licensed pilot," and it is still an undecided point whether or not this gives the power to fix rates for work done outside the district.

My view, right or wrong, has always been that the intention of the legislature was that a Pilotage Authority should have no powers outside its own district, and this point wants clearing up, because the practice is not the same at every port. It is not at every port that there is any fixed rate for work outside the district, and in the absence of any such provision a pilot is clearly his own master and directly he gets outside his district can fix his own rate, which, of course, must be a reasonable one.

A Question of Poundage

Then there is the further question whether or not payment for these outside services can be made liable to poundage. There again, my opinion for what it is worth, is that no rate which is not expressly and legally laid down by bye-law is subject to poundage, and indeed I question the legality of claiming poundage on payments for services outside the district, whether or not a rate is laid down by bye-law.

I have now mentioned two or three small points which illustrate the need for a simplification of the machinery under which pilotage dues are assessed and paid. There is really no need, in the light of the last thirty years' experience, for so complicated a system and these are only some of very similar cases.

Ships "Moved" by Unlicensed Men

As a matter of fact, the next matter to which I have to refer provides one more point which calls for consideration on a review of the Act, and that is the provision in Clause 32 with regard to ships within a harbour or dock. It will be remembered that that Clause provides that a ship whilst being moved within a harbour which forms part of a pilotage district is to be deemed a ship navigating in a pilotage district, except so far as may be provided by bye-law in the case of certain ships. The clause goes on to provide that a bye-law must be made to provide that a bye-law must be made to preserve this work for any class of persons

other than licensed pilots who were in practice employed at the date of the passing of the Act for the purpose of changing the moorings of ships or taking ships into or out of a dock.

A case has recently arisen in which it is contended that vessels coming within the terms of this clause of the Act may be piloted by employees of certain shipbuilding or ship repairing firms. No bye-law, however, had been made as called for by the Act, and the pilots of that port claimed the right to perform these services. The Pilotage Authority, which is in Scotland, put the case before the Procurator Fiscal with a view to a prosecution of the unlicensed men, but he has refused to prosecute on the ground that the Authority should have made a bye-law under the Section of the Act. The Pilotage Authority in question are of opinion that there never has been any class of persons within the meaning of the Act other than licensed pilots who were in fact employed at the date of the passing of the Act for this purpose.

In my opinion it was not intended by this section of the Act to afford protection to employees of shipbuilding or ship repairing firms who might wish their servants to perform these duties, and I have always understood that this section was passed only for the protection of a body of unlicensed men who made their living in whole or in part from this class of work. Employees of shipbuilding firms could never be in this category and these riggers whom the Procurator Fiscal is protecting by his refusal to prosecute have only been employed since the passing of the Pilotage Act on occasions for the purpose of moving vessels belonging to their employers. If his decision is right it may have far reaching results.

This is another clause of the Act which, after the lapse of 30 years, calls for some revision.

Claims for War Injuries

Some reference should perhaps be made to the Pensions Mercantile Marine Act 1942. I have had to consider this in connection with injuries to a pilot on two recent occasions. Under this Act a pilot who suffers injury by accident which is caused entirely or substantially by war conditions on board a ship which he is piloting can recover damages. It is necessary to prove that the injury is the result of enemy action or repelling enemy action or attributable to measures or abnormal conditions arising out of the war at sea. If the accident happens whilst the ship is in harbour, then a pilot has no claim under this Act unless it be the case that the accident was due to some abnormality on board the ship, such as an obstruction which would not be there but for war conditions. The mere absence of light which may have led to an accident whilst the ship is in harbour does not give rise to a claim under this Act, and in such case a pilot must pursue his remedies under other Acts according to the circumstances.

Conference will be discussing a resolution from Port Talbot in reference to the position of pilots under War Pensions and Detention Allowances (Mercantile Marine) Scheme 1939, and I would refer the pilots to previous statements on this matter which was most fully gone into at the commencement of the war. It is now coming to the fore again for the following reasons.

War Pensions Option

The pension payable to a pilot is fixed by reference to a corresponding naval rank which is based upon the gross tonnage of the ships piloted during the three years or twelve months preceding the death or injury. The claimant has the option of taking either period, but the value of this option, as was realised at the time, become less as the period of the war lengthens. At many ports the average tonnage of the vessels now being piloted is considerably less than pre-war and the risks, of course, in many cases are greatly increased. The present basis means a steadily reducing pension and Conference may decide that the time has come to re-open this matter.

It was recognised by the Ministry that this method of arriving at the equivalent naval rank of the pilots for the purpose of compensation under this scheme might adversely affect the position of pilots at many ports and the concession mentioned above was intended to meet this objection. It did so at the outset almost entirely, but with four years of the war passed, the option has now become of little value.

Problem of Remuneration

There is not much that I propose to say in reference to the question of pilotage dues, partly because this has been so fully dealt with year after year, and also because it is inextricably mixed up with post war pilotage as to which I shall have something to say later in this report. The fact is that the machinery has broken down under the stress of war conditions, as indeed it was obvious to most people was bound to happen.

The whole system is so complicated and involved that no two ports are alike and the fluctuations and vicissitudes of fortune under war conditions have made it very difficult for pilots to know just where they stand with regard to their remuneration.

This matter can be, I think, most usefully discussed in the light of the letter of the 25th June, 1943, from the Ministry of War Transport. That letter states concisely the position in which we find ourselves as a result of the war and lays it down that the general policy will be on the lines of that hitherto adopted, namely, subject to consideration of any special circumstances and to any objections, to confirm bye-laws submitted by particular districts to provide an increase in the pre-war rates by not more than 100 per cent so as to restore the net earnings to approximately the same as for the three years 1936, 1937, and 1938, and where those earnings are low, the Ministry are prepared to consider sympathetically.

etically applications to bring the net earnings above the pre-war figure.

This is stated to be in accordance with the policy of the Government towards its own servants and accordingly pilots whose remuneration is above a certain level, which is at the moment, I believe, £850 per annum, will not be in a position to make an application for any increase. As I understand the position, therefore, any port with earnings below the maximum figure can apply for an increase if those earnings are below the pre-war standard arrived at as above. This intimation was given immediately to every port and some have taken advantage of the open door. Whether or not all have done so, it is impossible to say because I have not got the latest figures from every port. Applications are pending from one or two ports for increases which can only be brought into line with the policy of the Ministry as stated in the letter referred to by pleading special circumstances which may or may not exist. Incidentally I have just received information from the Ministry that they have given an increase of 25 per cent to Hartlepool.

It is impossible to reconcile the present earnings of the pilots at some ports with those at other ports and a system which tolerates the pilots at any port where a pilotage service is necessary earning less than £100 per annum must be a faulty one, quite apart from the unfairness and inequality of its operation. The difficulties and the problems which beset us when we tackle this question of pilotage dues and pilots' remuneration are too painfully familiar to every one and no arguments are wanted to support the contention that a complete overhaul of the present system is long overdue.

Testing Days

I should like to add some general observations on the question of pilotage rates and pilots' remuneration.

For sixty years this Association has been concerned upon the behalf of the pilots in all their vicissitudes of fortune, in their good days and their bad days; many a battle has been fought and won—some have been lost—we have seen this Association steer the pilots through the difficulties of and following the last war, not to mention the negotiations which led to the passing of the Pilotage Act of 1913—and through the years of depression in the shipping industry.

A search through the files of this Association during those most testing days will find no word of complaint, or charge of failure, but, on the contrary, expressions of gratitude to the Association, which reflected a general state of contentment with its work.

Then you found yourselves involved in the upheaval of another war, and inevitably the question of pilotage rates became the problem of almost every port, and at some ports an almost insoluble problem. One or two ports, and only one or two, have wanted this Association to go all out in pressing the

Ministry for a general increase in rates. The pre-war standard was no good to them, because their earnings were already in excess of that figure, and so the cry was "Let us have a general increase on our present earnings regardless of pre-war standards, and if the Ministry refuses the demand then we must refuse to accept their decision." Well, this Association has not listened to those counsels with the result that two ports have allied themselves with an organisation that "Will not take 'No' for an answer."

There are those who look to make money out of the war, and indeed to hold the country up to ransom in order to improve their position. Witness the recent strikes which are blots upon the most glorious chapters of this country's history. Up to the present, this Association has led the pilots along a different path which, I think, will never be regretted. That path has led to the position stated in the letter of the 25th June, 1943, from the Ministry of War Transport. The Liverpool and Manchester pilots say that this is a poor achievement, and will, I suppose, be pressing soon for something better—I venture to think otherwise but we shall see.

I know that you are working under very difficult conditions, as indeed most people are, long hours and highly responsible duties performing a service of the greatest possible value at this time. I know, too, that you value quite rightly the high professional status which this Association has helped to preserve. But a professional status carries with it certain obligations and sets a limit to demands which might otherwise be made.

There is no need for me to enlarge upon that now, but I have seen in recent statements from certain ports arguments which might prevail in the case of a docker, but are inconsistent with the position of a professional man.

I now turn away from this question of rates because, after all, there are other matters, and many of them, which are the constant care of this Association.

Post-War Pilotage

I now pass naturally to the only other matter, and you may well think the most important one which will be discussed at this Conference. You have been prepared for the discussion on post-war pilotage by the communications which the Executive Committee has addressed to every port during recent months and by the discussions of the Executive Committee reported in the last two issues of *The Pilot*.

I may be forgiven for reminding the Conference in this connection of the Seven Points Policy, because, had those proposals been adopted by the pilots, if only for the purposes of discussion and exploration of the problems which then confronted us, we might have very well solved in advance many of the problems which face us to-day. I need refer to only one of them, namely, the recommendation of your Executive Committee of those days that

all pilot cutters should be owned and maintained by the Pilotage Authority, which met with the strongest opposition from ports who have now changed right round and would to-day, I think, heartily support that proposal. However, nothing is to be gained by going over that ground, and we have just got to face up to the position as we find it to-day.

I have received from several ports an expression of their views upon the questions raised in the Ministry's letter of 24th June, 1943, but I can gather no clear impression of the view of the general body of pilots from these communications.

Some Possible Reforms

There seems to be unanimity that compulsory pilotage should be made general over the country, which this Association has always stood for, also that pilots should retain their present status by which I understand that pilots shall continue, as at present, to hold a pilot's license to be granted by some official body and to retain the position of professional men. There is general agreement also that there is room for improvement in the financing of Benefit Funds, and also, I think, that all pilot vessels should be owned and maintained by the Pilotage Authority. But all those objects which I have just mentioned could be achieved without interfering with the present administration of pilotage and without a very serious amendment of the Pilotage Act.

The point on which I can get no light at all from the replies which I have received is whether or not the pilots wish to see any vital change in

1. The present administration of pilotage.
2. The present method of providing a pilot's remuneration; and
3. The constant uncertainty as to the amount of the remuneration so as to call for drastic amendment or even repeal of the Pilotage Act.

A strong case can, I think, be made out for a simplification of the various schedules of rates under which pilotage dues are assessed, and collected. These schedules have tended to become more and more complicated and involved. Not only so, but an extra charge which is almost word for word the same in two sets of bye-laws receives often a different interpretation.

Is it necessary for a pilot's remuneration to be made up in part by a series of extra services, and is it beyond the wit of man to devise a simple and concise schedule of rates which would be fair to both the shipowner and the pilot?

Opinion has Changed

Many ports are well satisfied with their local Authority and, I find, a considerable change of opinion on this point during the past four years of war. It may be that local shipowners find themselves under war conditions in a position to be rather more sympathetic with the pilots when they ask for increases. I do not know at all what the reason is, but subject to what may be said at

this Conference, I find to-day a different atmosphere from that which was existing before the war in some ports. On the other hand, there are ports, and they have so expressed themselves in recent communications to me, who would like to see a change, if only to simplify the procedure generally and to bring all the pilots more into line with a common and agreed policy.

I find a general complaint from those ports, who are ready to see a change, about the big difference in the earnings of certain comparable ports which can be accounted for solely by the different opinion and outlook of the particular Pilotage Authority. The kind of thing which helps to form an opinion of that kind is a comparison of two ports—and quite likely two neighbouring ports. The pilot at one port finds himself doing twice the amount of pilotage done by the pilot at the other port and yet receiving 50 per cent less remuneration. If the services are comparable that should not happen.

Central Authority not a New Idea

There is a fairly strong body of opinion in favour of some form of Central Authority. When the Pilotage Act was passed the Board of Trade was intended to be more or less a Central Pilotage Authority, but they do not really function as such. They are more in the position of arbitrators to reconcile differences between the three main interested parties, namely the Pilotage Authority, shipowners and pilots, and in the absence of any differences to be adjudicated on, their duty is to see that Pilotage bye-laws comply with the provisions of the Pilotage Act and are generally conducive to an efficient pilotage service.

Many pilots here will be interested to know that in 1888 when discussions were taking place prior to the passing of the Merchant Shipping Act 1889, the pilots of that day were pressing for a National Board of Pilotage to be set up. At that time the Board of Trade was the nominal head, but they had been forced to admit in effect that they had really no power over Pilotage Authorities and hence the confusion of those days which the 1889 Act did little or nothing to remedy.

Since then there has been more than one Committee set up to discuss Pilotage matters, the last, of course, being the Departmental Committee in 1911 upon whose recommendations the Pilotage Act was framed. That act armed the Board of Trade with considerably greater power than they possessed in 1888 when pilots were asking for a National Board to take over the administration of pilotage at every port, but in the light of the experience of 30 years, I am by no means sure that the time has not come for the appointment of a Central Pilotage Authority which would exercise a much closer control of Pilotage than the Board of Trade were ever intended to do or could do under the operation of the Pilotage Act 1913.

For a period of years following the passing of the Act in 1913, Commissioners were

appointed for the purposes of Part I of the Act and it was in the minds of some people, at the time, that a Pilotage Commission might continue to function in connection with the Board of Trade and so form a sort of Central Authority.

Going back more than 100 years to the Royal Commission of 1836, we find that there was then a very strong feeling that a Central Pilotage Authority should be set up containing expert knowledge for the administration of pilotage at every port.

Advantages of Central Control

In my opinion, a good many of the present difficulties and grievances can be traced to the absence of a central controlling Authority, which would have not only the knowledge, but the power of bringing the various ports into line with one another and so avoiding the unexplainable differences, not only in the remuneration of pilots, which, of course, must vary to some extent according to the class of shipping at the different ports, but also, and in the main, in the matters of general administration, assessment, method of raising and collecting pilotage dues. With a Central Authority exercising a general control over the whole body of pilots, one would not, I think, find such wide discrepancies existing, not only in conditions of working, but in the remuneration of the pilots at the ports under their jurisdiction.

Incidentally, a change on these lines would facilitate the creation of a Central Pilots' Benefit Fund, and though I am no expert in such matters, it must be that one large fund, supported and financed by every port, would be a better proposition than the separate, and sometimes very small, Benefit Funds of the individual ports. Naturally a suggestion of this sort will call for safeguards to protect the rights of pilots under existing Benefit Funds, but this could be done.

Whether or not the idea of a salary will commend itself to the pilots generally, I have no idea, but I hope this question can be discussed on the assumption that the salary would be an adequate one. The amount of the salary and how the ports would be graded for the purpose of fixing it is, of course, vitally important, but first of all the principle of payment by salary instead of under a fluctuating scale has to be discussed.

Not the Only Alternative

A Central Authority is not, of course the only alternative to the present system. It is one of the obvious alternatives, but there are others which could be brought about by an amendment of the Pilotage Act without interfering with the present jurisdiction of existing Pilotage Authorities. So long however, as pilotage continues to be administered by separate Pilotage Authorities with each one acting independently, there is little chance of getting rid of many apparent injustices between the pilots of different ports and bringing some measure of uniformity not only to the administration of pilotage but in the matter of their remuneration.

In these few remarks, I am stating just one point of view, not, it must be understood, the view of the Executive Committee or of this Association, or the view which I should presume to press upon this Association. It is a point of view entirely my own which will find expression and support in some quarters, and it will at any rate serve the purpose of focusing the discussion which will follow when the Conference comes to discuss post-war problems.

There are, I know, strong arguments for the retention of local Authorities as at present, but, of course, under any other system there would have to be, as in all Trinity House Outports, some body to deal on the spot with the many questions which arise from day to day. I do not know whether a greater measure of uniformity is required or even desired, but it would, I think, iron out many difficulties and grievances. If so, one obvious way of obtaining uniformity is to have one central body controlling pilotage.

When I began to write this report, it was my firm intention to shorten it in view of the very important discussions which are to follow in the limited time at your disposal. Also, I felt, that the ground has already been so thoroughly prepared for the debate that I could not usefully add anything at this stage. That some change must come about after the war seems inevitable, and it is all to the good that this Association is able to present and press the views of the pilots at 57 out of 60 Ports in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

DEBATE ON THE REPORT

Mr. Line congratulated Sir John on such an excellent report on different matters and moved its adoption.

Mr. Watson seconded.

A variety of points were raised in the ensuing discussion and a number of them referred to matters which really belonged to the subject of post-war pilotage debated at a later session.

A suggestion that they were trying to run the Association too cheaply came from Mr. Catton. He said that at the time when they combined the offices of secretary and solicitor they were governed by considerations of economy but how were they, a body of professional men, to go ahead with the times and maintain their status on a subscription of 36 shillings per annum? He recalled that at one Conference dinner the First Lord of the Admiralty, then as now, Mr. A. V. Alexander, in his speech expressed surprise that the Association could ever exist on such an annual payment.

This brought the interjection from the Chairman: "There is more than one that wonders that to-day—I am one of them."

"Is it not time," asked Mr. Catton, "that we did something to bring ourselves up to the scratch?" He suggested that they should have an adequately paid secretary who could give his whole time to the work and that the subscription should be increased to provide

for this. They could not expect Sir John to go dodging about all over the country to deal with the matters which arose at the various ports.

The Chairman told Conference something of the work from his own knowledge Sir John succeeded in getting through. "It takes several hours a week to study what he sends me," added Mr. Webb.

When Mr. Daves (Swansea) argued that pilots should have consideration for the increased cost of living and suggested that they were the only profession which did not get it, Sir John pointed out that lawyers, accountants, estate agents, and other professional men were not getting any compensation.

Mr. Hughes complained of the unsatisfactory superannuation arrangements at his port (Llanelli). Although there was a fund of £6,000 and only five pilots instead of ten in pre-war days, the pension was only 15/- a week.

The closing sentence in the report that the Association represented 57 out of 60 ports provoked the inquiry from Mr. Akerman for the percentage of the pilots who were members.

Sir John replied that the Board of Trade returns were no longer published and he did not know how many pilots were working at the ports. Some had left temporarily but were continuing their subscriptions to the Association.

Mr. Akerman said he asked the question because his district had always had 100 per cent. membership until some temporary men were appointed. He tackled one of them, who came from another district, and said that he had always wished to be a member but nobody had asked him.

Of course the Chairman promptly asked what district that was and Conference laughed heartily when Mr. Akerman replied "Gravesend."

PILOTING OUTSIDE A DISTRICT

Replying to a point raised by Mr. Goldsmith, Sir John said that £850 was a material figure only when an application for an increase to cover the cost of living was under consideration. Such an application would not be entertained if the pre-war earnings were £850 but any port with £500 a year pre-war could apply provided the current earnings did not give the pilots something to cover increased cost of living. If the figure was now £525 for instance, they might not get an increase. An application could be made where the earnings were below the pre-war standard. Another matter also mentioned by Mr. Goldsmith was whether there existed a schedule of rates for piloting outside a pilotage district. He suggested one on a mileage basis—a shilling a mile for the first 100 miles, sixpence a mile afterwards. During wartime a man was not allowed to pilot outside his district unless he held a deep sea certificate.

Mr. Smith thought this referred to an Admiralty rate, which as far as he knew died

out with the last war, and he did not know whether it had applied to all districts. It was now a case of getting what they could.

The same question arose during the Clyde inquiry some years ago and Mr. Webb recalled that Admiral Munro who presided, remarked that he did not think any Authority had any right to lay down a rate outside the district but he thought it would be an excellent thing to fix one not as legally binding, but as a guide.

Mr. Goldsmith said it struck him that the Authority issuing the certificate might have the right to decide what the remuneration should be.

The experience of Dundee where there are no men holding outside certificates was related by Mr. Grafton who said that it was agreed that they could go provided the master wanted them and the Naval Officer-in-charge gave his permission.

This discussion led Mr. Clare to inquire where these licences could be obtained and the Chairman explained that when the Pilotage Act was passed a Pilotage Authority had the right to make application for powers to grant deep sea licences and only these Authorities that applied and obtained permission could grant them.

Mr. Line gave the additional information that the permission was confined to the Trinity Houses of Great Britain—London, Newcastle, Firth of Forth, and Hull—and suggested Mr. Clare could get a licence through one of them.

"You can add Glasgow because we have power," supplemented Mr. Webb, amid laughter.

The report was adopted.

FINANCE

Mr. Webb as Chairman of the Finance Committee introduced the statement of accounts for the year ending December 31st, 1942, and the balance sheet at that date, published in *The Pilot* for April of this year. They were adopted on the motion of Mr. Catton, seconded by Mr. Fernie.

The resolutions on the agenda were then discussed. The first, in the name of Swansea, proposed affiliation to the Navigator and Engineer Officers' Union. Discussion went on for a time and was then broken off until the afternoon session, the Chairman announcing that Capt. W. H. Coombs, President of the Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation Ltd. had been invited to address them at luncheon. The discussion and the address by Capt. Coombs are therefore dealt with in a separate section on pages 14-16.

POUNDAGE ON SALVAGE

Association to take a Test Case to Court

"That the Association take the necessary action to obtain a legal decision regarding the payment of poundage on salvage awards to pilots."

This was proposed by Mr. Martin Davis, seconded by Mr. Elven, and supported by

Messrs. Line, Ritchie and others but it was not necessary to put it to a vote, the Chairman announcing that a test case would be taken up as soon as possible.

The resolution was the outcome of an experience by Mr. Davis, but, as he said during the discussion, it had a bearing on every port. He told Conference in these words what had happened to him:

"In the issue of *The Pilot* of February, 1942, the Secretary wrote that poundage was not payable on salvage awards. In consequence of this, I got into touch with the Association and, after stating my case and receiving the considered legal opinion and advice of Sir John, I decided, in the interests of all pilots and with the consent of my brother pilots, to make a stand, declining to pay to Trinity House £1. 17. 6d. poundage which they claimed on my award. I sent them a letter to that effect on June 10th, 1942.

"Correspondence between Trinity House and myself took place during the next four months throughout which I received advice and help from Sir John, which I greatly appreciated. Finally, in September last, whilst Conference was sitting, I received an order to appear before Trinity House in a disciplinary matter for refusing to obey their order to pay poundage. After telephonic communication with Trinity House during Conference, Sir John advised me to pay the poundage under protest and he also sent a letter to them dated October 2nd, 1942, stating his views in regard to my case which was read when I attended before the Pilotage Board. In these circumstances the disciplinary case against me was dismissed, but the question of payment of poundage remained unsolved. It became clear that this point could only be decided by a proper legal authority and would necessitate taking a test case to Court.

"In the debate on the Secretary's report at the last Conference, the matter was discussed and the Chairman gave an assurance that the Executive would look into it, and on October 9th last Sir John wrote to me that another case of the same kind had been reported to him from an Outport pilot and that the question would have to await consideration by the Executive Committee.

"We are strongly of the opinion that the question *does* affect the general body of pilots, as other ports beside London are interested and any decision obtained in respect of the principal Pilotage Authority viz. Trinity House, would govern the decision of other Authorities. It follows, therefore, that this is a matter for the Association to take up and not the individual pilot. Although this subject is perhaps not literally pilotage, pilots' interests are involved and we look to the Association to protect them in the broadest sense.

"The London Sea Pilots (North Channel) in bringing this forward on a matter of principle and in support of Sir John's considered legal opinion, have decided to ask

Conference to give the Executive authority to take the necessary action to obtain a legal decision which will finally settle the issue."

Sir John did not want it to be thought that the result of one test case would necessarily cover every port. It was conceivable that some port had a bye-law authorising the Authority to claim poundage on salvage awards. He also stated, in reply to Mr. Elven who said Trinity House had said they would deal with Mr. Davis's licence if he did not pay, that they had been advised by their solicitor that poundage was payable. Following a visit he paid to Trinity House the disciplinary action was withdrawn and they were quite agreeable to a friendly case being taken to court for a decision.

Mr. Watson mentioned a case at Falmouth where the pilots' claim for salvage was treated as "extra services" and they had to pay poundage.

Claim for income tax on an award was wrong, Mr. Mock contended, and he mentioned a case at Swansea in which they applied for a refund—and got it.

It was evident that Conference endorsed a remark by Mr. Smith congratulating Mr. Davis on "sticking up to Trinity House as he did."

COMPULSORY PILOTAGE

"Always one of the Association's planks"

"That no reduction in the present areas of compulsory pilotage should take place. Any change in this direction should be to establish compulsory pilotage throughout the United Kingdom."

This proposal submitted by Mr. Windass on behalf of London River produced considerable discussion but it was not put to the meeting, the Chairman giving the assurance that the Association would always keep general compulsory pilotage to the front. It had always been one of the planks of the Association, he said, but to start anything at the moment would be futile. With Mr. Windass on the Executive they were not likely to be allowed to lose sight of it.

Mr. Windass emphasised that the resolution was designed to stop the shipowner saying to the master, "You must take your ship into this port, it is non-compulsory." Many masters were compelled to navigate in waters where they would be very glad to have a pilot.

The Chairman pointed out that the pilots would be financially worse off if they were compelled to work every little thing in their districts.

Mr. Hughes contended that non-compulsory ships should contribute towards the pilot service.

Anxiety as to what would happen after the war was expressed by Mr. Taylor, Mr. Clare and others.

ASSURANCE THE MINISTRY CANNOT GIVE

Mr. Clare quoted from a letter from the Ministry of War Transport to the Bristol Channel Pilotage Services Joint Committee in reply to a request that the Minister should defer reducing any pilotage rates in the Bristol Channel districts and arrange with the Admiralty to defer altering the existing compulsory pilotage arrangements until a comprehensive scheme was submitted to him, such deferment to be reviewed every six months.

"It is understood," the Ministry wrote, "that this request applies only to post-war period. The Minister regrets that, as it is impossible at this date to foresee with any certainty the circumstances which will prevail on the conclusion of hostilities, he is unable to give any assurance such as that desired by the Committee. The present compulsory pilotage arrangements rest partly on Orders, etc. made under the Defence (General) Regulations and it is possible that the enabling regulations may be revoked or amended before the Committee are in a position to submit a comprehensive scheme, in which case conditions regarding compulsory pilotage would automatically revert, in the absence of other arrangements, to the pre-war position. The Minister will, however, bear the request of the Committee in hand."

EXEMPTED SHIPS

Mr. Bray, who seconded the London River proposition, mentioned the case of ships built in Canada specially for the British coasting trade. Under London River bye-laws a ship coming from a foreign country had to complete 60 days on the British coasts before she could obtain an exemption certificate. Because the ships were built in the British Empire the Admiral of the Nore granted them exemption as soon as they entered the Thames. The ships represented the pilots' living and in being granted exemption certificates they were empowered to go anywhere in the river without employing a pilot, or, if they did employ a pilot, they did so at a greatly reduced rate. Was the Admiral of the Nore within his authority in doing that? Could he go contrary to the laws of the port as they stood?

Sir John said this was the first he had heard of the matter and it should obviously be looked into.

What he described as a parallel case was mentioned by Mr. Catton. At the outset of the war, he said, the Admiralty thought fit to sweep away the living of the watermen who had certain rights in shifting ships on the river. They had only a small association but they went to see the Flag Officer and the matter was put right.

It was agreed that Sir John should look into the matter of ships built outside the United Kingdom being issued with certificates of exemption.

ADMINISTRATIVE BODIES

Adequate Representation for Pilots Urged

"That adequate representation on administrative bodies dealing with pilotage matters should be given to pilots."

This London River resolution was moved by Mr. Catton and seconded by Mr. Bray.

In the discussion several delegates, including those of Swansea and Barry, expressed dissatisfaction concerning the Pilotage Authorities or Committees of their ports. Although the pilots had representation on those bodies, nominally on equal terms with the shipowners, there were other members who sympathies were certainly not with the pilots. "I would much sooner deal with a straight shipowner than another fellow who is neither shipowner nor pilot," commented Mr. Webb.

Mr. Catton complained that matters which were settled by the Committee on which the pilots were represented, to the satisfaction of the pilots, were reversed by the Board. This experience was shared by Mr. Chesterfield who said that at Hull the pilots sat only on a sub-committee of the Board, and what was wanted was representation on the higher authority.

Mr. Goldsmith said that there was a committee at Trinity House known as the Pilot and Benefit Fund Committee and pilots were represented on it, presumably with the object of having some say in its affairs. Recently certain stocks were sold and the first the pilots' representative heard of it was when he was informed by letter that the sale had taken place. The only time a pilot was required on the Pilotage Committee was on a disciplinary matter, never in the ordinary administration of pilotage affairs.

Another instance, mentioned by Mr. Line, was the hiring of a brewery, the cost being borne out of poundage paid by the pilots but without reference to them!

"We already have the right under the Act to be represented," said Mr. Smith, "but the question of what is adequate is another matter. The Executive will accept this as an intimation that you are not satisfied."

Conference agreed, without a vote, with the Chairman's suggestion that the Association would do all it could to get adequate representation.

This completed the business at the morning session.

SHALL THE U.K.P.A. FEDERATE?

Captain W. H. Coombs, President of the Officers' Federation explains his organisation to Conference

PILOTS AT THE PORTS INVITED TO EXPRESS THEIR WISHES

ON the first day of the Conference an important discussion took place on the proposal that the U.K.P.A. should enter the alliance known as the Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation Ltd., of which Captain W. H. Coombs is President.

At the meeting of the Executive Committee on the previous evening it was decided to invite Capt. Coombs to be the guest of the pilots at luncheon. He accepted and made a cordial speech of greetings and good wishes in the name of the Federation. Afterwards he addressed the Conference and answered a number of questions. In view of the confidential nature of the discussions the Press were not present.

When Conference voted it was found that there was an almost equal division of opinion and it was therefore decided, having regard also to the fact that a considerable number of districts were not represented, to refer the question to the pilots at the ports for an expression of opinion to guide the Executive Committee.

Capt. Coombs pointed out that he was speaking to the Conference by invitation and emphasised that he was there not to advocate the U.K.P.A. joining the Officers' Federation, but merely to give information about the purpose and constitution of the Federation. He said he would regard it as an impertinence on his part if he sought to tell the pilots how to run their affairs.

He explained that the Officers' Federation was constituted on parallel lines to the Shipping Federation which was of course, a federation of shipowners' organisations variously constituted as protection and indemnity clubs, insurance companies, employers' associations, and the like. The Officers' Federation at present consisted of ten British officers' organisations in the United Kingdom and overseas; two of these were trade unions affiliated to the T.U.C., the others were guilds and associations with various constitutions. Each federated organisation maintained complete independence in running its own affairs and retained completely independent control of its own finances. The Federation was financed by capitation fees paid to it by each of the federated organisations.

Answering questions, Capt. Coombs agreed that there were occasions when the interests of pilots and shipmasters might conflict—just as there were rare occasions when the interests of the liner officers might vary somewhat from those of tramp steamer officers, but for every case of difference, he suggested there would be a hundred cases of identity of interest. He believed in concentrating on points of agreement rather than contemplat-

ing the points of disagreement which in practice, seldom arose.

TRADE UNIONISM

He reminded those who were critical of trade unionism, of the immense service rendered to the country by trade unions and the T.U.C. There was, of course, much prejudice in some quarters about trade unionism due, he considered, to ignorance of the subject and blind prejudice. In his view, trade unionism was a good thing. Admittedly as with religion and alcohol, the abuse of a good thing was bad but that did not condemn the institution. He had been informed that a number of pilots were looking towards orthodox trade unionism as a means for the betterment of their affairs. The decision on that matter was obviously the concern of the pilots themselves and their Association. He ventured to urge the Conference that they should not regard this trend towards trade unionism with hostility or ignore it, but regard it as evidence that pilots were taking a lively interest in their own affairs. In the past, the Navigators and Engineer Officers' Union—one of the federated organisations—whenever asked to enrol a pilot, always insisted that if that pilot were a member of the U.K.P.A., he should continue such membership as a condition of membership of the N. & E.O.U. That policy had been followed because he had always believed in constructive effort and no useful purpose was served in destroying any organised effort.

Reverting to the subject of federation, Capt. Coombs was asked: "Would affiliation by the U.K.P.A. to the Officers' Federation hamper in any way independent action by the U.K.P.A.?"

Capt. Coombs explained that the federated organisations through the Federation sought to—and had succeeded in—formulating a common policy. If any of the federated organisations disagreed with that policy, they were of course, at liberty to resign, which fact alone would obviously have the effect of a renewed attempt to reach a policy acceptable to all the federated organisations.

Asked what his views were as to the position of seafarers and pilots after the war, Capt. Coombs replied:

"I am not a prophet but of this I am certain—that the future well-being of seafarers will in great measure depend upon the degree of sound organisation among them and upon the adoption of an agreed policy among the various organisations representing the various sections of the seafaring community."

In expressing thanks to Capt. Coombs, the Chairman expressed the hope that their friendship would continue whatever the decision of the Conference might be as to federation.

In acknowledging these thanks, Capt. Coombs said he regarded it as a privilege to be invited to speak at their Conference and reiterated that he had not attended with a view to advocating federation to them; indeed, he reminded them that the Federation had become a close co-operation and that application for membership was by no means a guarantee of admission to that select body!

Capt. Coombs then left and Conference dealt with the resolutions on the agenda bearing on the subject.

Some of the points raised in a brief discussion at the morning session were clarified by the address given by Capt. Coombs and his replies to questions. It will therefore avoid confusion in the minds of those who were not present at the Conference and have to rely on this printed record, if those passages are not included here.

THE RESOLUTIONS

There were two resolutions bearing on the subject on the agenda:

SWANSEA: "That the U.K.P.A. affiliate with the Navigator and Engineer Officers' Union at some early date."

FALMOUTH: "That the U.K.P.A. should link up with the Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation Ltd. and also that in the interests of piloting a pilot representative should be on the Masters' Panel."

The Swansea resolution was first on the agenda and in moving it at the morning session Mr. Mock said "We realise that the Association has done a lot and could possibly do more with this extra backing." At the afternoon session he suggested adding to the resolution:

"and that the membership fee be increased to four guineas."

Sir John, however, suggested that the proposals of the two ports should be amalgamated as follows:

"That the U.K.P.A. become affiliated with the Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation Ltd."

This was accepted by Mr. Mock and Mr. Watson.

There was some discussion on the effect federation would have on pilots who had already joined the Union or were inclined to do so. Mr. Watson said that if the U.K.P.A. federated there would be no need for pilots to belong to any other body; they would be directed to the Association as the masters were directed to their organisation.

Sir John said Capt. Coombs always insisted that their pilot members should also belong to the Association. "On the other hand," continued Sir John, "he wants you to let him know whether he should not relax the rule rather than pilots should go to another Union. He says there is among the pilots an apparent trend to join a union of some sort."

"Are we satisfied, or do we think the Association is not strong enough to float alone?" asked Mr. Pead. "If we are not strong enough surely we should be told where the weakness lies?"

Mr. Innes said that the issue had been brought about by the feeling that the U.K.P.A. was not sufficiently strong and some had said this was through lack of finance. Would it not be sensible to increase the subscription to put it on a stronger financial basis and make the U.K.P.A. the body they wanted it to be?

"I can't see what you are going to gain by affiliating," said Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Chesterfield asked "Why are we suffering from this inferiority complex? We ought to strengthen our own organisation; it is capable of dealing with pilotage matters. We are the recognised body on pilotage."

Mr. Catton referred to the Parliamentary support the pilots had in the past but asked, "Can we say we can rely on this Member or that?" and added "The time has come to look round and see if we can get assistance elsewhere, while maintaining at all times our identity—that is understood. Affiliation with the Federation is one of the short cuts to assistance should occasion arise."

Mr. Slade remarked that they would get strength if they increased the subscription.

A full time assistant for Sir John to go round to the ports was urged by Mr. Catton.

Mr. Grafton asked Sir John if in his opinion affiliation would do the pilots any good but Sir John said he would not like to influence the pilots in the matter at the present stage.

Mr. Davies: The object is to give more force and power to this Association. We think if we link up with Capt. Coombs it will be the means of getting these people on the Mersey back.

The Chairman: What do you mean by more power? You can't get power to get past the law.

Mr. Davies: When they joined the T.U.C. it opened doors official, political and industrial.

Mr. Jones: Can Mr. Davies give us a single case where a problem set before the Association and dealt with by the Executive has failed?

Mr. Davies: The Mersey pilots leaving the Association. What has the Association done to get them back? I am convinced that if we link up they will leave the Transport Union and come back to the fold.

Mr. Jones: A few years ago Liverpool covered this Executive with praise for what Sir John had done—we had never had such thanks. Where have we failed with the Liverpool pilots? Can you tell me why they went out? They have gone over to the fallacy of Hitler that force is strength. If we want to adopt that attitude we had better join the T.U.C. right away.

Mr. Davies: I have spoken to some of them and they have great respect for this Association. It only needs a little persuasion and they will come back.

Mr. Smith admitted that he had "come under the spell of Capt. Coombs" and said that he had been impressed by the assurance that they did not have to join a union to link up with the Federation.

Mr. Love favoured a deferment of a decision so that they might reflect on the proposition and notify the Association. The Chairman, however, wanted it cleared up. As the Association would remain an independent body affiliation was perhaps worth a trial.

Support for the resolution came from Mr. Sparrow on the ground that it would let the Chamber of Shipping know that the pilots were associated with something better than the Transport Union and were wide awake.

Mr. Chesterfield urged Conference not to treat it as an experiment; they should go into it with their eyes wide open.

"I hope if we federate," said Mr. Mock, "we shall go into it with the intention of making it a success and not coming out next year."

The resolution was then put to Conference and on a show of hands there were counted for 22, against 21.

The Chairman was in a quandary. By giving a vote against he would have made the figures balance, so it was decided to count again. This time the verdict was: for 21, against 23.

THE MIDDLE COURSE

Conference, however, was not happy about it and then Sir John came forward with a suggestion which was accepted without opposition. It was this, in his words:

"As it was a very close vote it occurs to me, as a middle course, that you should all go back to your ports, call the pilots together at the first opportunity, and put before them what has happened. Then every port should write to me giving their views to be put before the Executive at their next meeting. If there is sufficient body of opinion in favour of it the Executive is empowered to call a one day meeting of this Association."

There was some discussion on how the view of the ports should be measured, whether each port should have one vote or according to membership. The possibility of large districts swamping the vote in the case was mentioned.

Sir John explained that the proposed reference was only to give the Executive some idea of the feeling of the ports.

When Conference accepted the suggestion, the adoption of which was formally moved by Mr. Mock, the Chairman commented "I should not be surprised if an emergency conference is held within six months."

At a later stage in the Conference Mr. Mock gave notice that at the next Conference he would move:

"That federation with the Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation Limited be reconsidered."

This was accepted, the Chairman saying that it conformed with the requirements of the rules.

WAR PENSIONS

Pilots' "Very Good Case" for a Better Basis

"The pilots viewing with great concern the fact that the scale of pensions covering War Risks is based on the average gross tonnage handled per pilot over a period of three years preceding any accident, are of opinion that a more just basis would be for such scale to be based on the tonnage handled during the period before the commencement of hostilities."

This resolution was moved by Mr. Gunn on behalf of Port Talbot who said that the average gross tonnage of the port had fallen considerably since the collapse of France, yet they were handling more ships and accepting more risks. They were concerned because under the pension scheme they would be on the basis of a lieutenant.

Mr. Spurrier who seconded said that at Newport the average tonnage had been cut by at least half.

The decision in which many delegates took part revealed considerable dissatisfaction with the scale of pensions. Mr. Watson spoke in favour of a fixed pension and Mr. Davies (Swansea) said it would be more satisfactory if it were on the basis of a first lieutenant—a Port Talbot pilot would rank to-day as a second lieutenant. Mr. Day, however, thought that of lieutenant-commander would be fairer.

Mr. Bray pointed out they were being included more or less in a service pension scheme. A captain in the army who was killed might have been a bricklayer before the war but was not given a bricklayer's pension. The pilot's pension ought to be based on his years in the service.

One of the anomalies of the present position was stressed by Mr. Clare who said that he might still handle the same number of ships, but if, in addition, he handled 50 others of lower tonnage his average might be reduced to bring him down to the basis of a lieutenant, although his aggregate tonnage would be higher.

"A gross injustice" was the term applied by Mr. Smith to the ruling that the pilot who lost his life through enemy action while taking a ship into dock was treated differently from one who was lost while taking a ship to or from sea. The argument was that the crew on board the former ship received the lower scale of civilian pensions.

Mr. Goldsmith pointed out that some pilots had joined the service since the war began and had no tonnage basis.

Sir John said it was curious that this discussion should have followed on that concerning the Federation, because the masters might have something to say on the matter. After four years of war the option of the three years' average had ceased to be of much value. He would be quite happy to go to the Ministry of Pensions again if Conference so decided.

The Chairman: All that we have heard to-day will be taken into consideration. Is that satisfactory?

Conference agreed and then adjourned for the day.

MINISTRY'S FOUR POINTS

Conference in Debate on Post-War Problems decides the answers to be given

WHEN Conference re-assembled on the morning of September 30th, the debate on Post-War Problems took place. It turned very largely on the letter from the Ministry of War Transport of June 25th, 1943, which was printed in the August issue of *The Pilot*. The communication directed attention to four specific points and in the later stages of the discussion Conference voted on the answers to be given to them.

The Chairman opened the proceedings with an important speech at the end of which Mr. Ritchie raised the question of the Press being present and, on a show of hands, Conference agreed that they should remain.

Mr. Webb: In the Ministry of War Transport's letter there is a very clear intimation that a change will take place in the Pilotage Act at the end of the war; it also makes suggestions for the pilots to consider and put forward their views.

Neither the U.K.P.A. nor any body of pilots, as far as I know, has in any way been instrumental in suggesting such a revolution in pilotage as may come about. It cannot be overlooked, however, that for years this Association has received complaining letters from many districts as to:

1. Constitution of Authorities.
2. Administration of funds.
3. Granting of pilotage certificates.
4. Boarding and landing fees.
5. Pilotage dues.
6. Compulsory pilotage.
7. Benefit Funds; and so on.

With very few exceptions all these matters have been administered by the Authorities correctly within the provisions of the Pilotage Act.

The many and varied applications and protests made by this Association on behalf of the pilots have, no doubt, helped to show that the Act in many ways does not function as well as might be desired, and I am of opinion that the shipowners have the same view.

NOT LIKE SHOPKEEPERS

There is only one point I resent in the Minister's letter and that is comparing the profession of a pilot, who is a specialist, to the business of a shopkeeper, because in good prosperous times no one interferes with the profits or the income of a shopkeeper and, if times are bad with him, he can remove to another place, whereas the pilot has to work on the rates "demanded by law" and, being on piecework, finds not infrequently when times are good that the rates "demanded by law" are reduced, but when times are bad with him he has to put up with it; he cannot, like the shopkeeper, go somewhere else and try his luck but has to remain with a very reduced income and in some cases, as we have seen during this war, earn next to nothing.

Now let us for a moment consider the clauses put before us suggesting a change.

There is no compulsion whatever at present, nor can there be until the Act is replaced or amended. The question for this Conference is to decide what you want and instruct your Executive what to do. Let us therefore consider:

1. No change. This means you are satisfied with the Pilotage Act as it is, its administration, and all the points I have before mentioned.

2. Continuance of the Act, but with certain amendments, and with the present Pilotage Authorities subject to the Board of Trade.

3. Centralisation, which as far as I see simply means the present form of administration with a Central Authority over districts, and with a much amended Act.

4. Dock or Harbour Authorities, under which I presume you would receive a weekly or monthly wage; whether you would hold a licence or not I do not know.

The one remaining change is not mentioned: I refer to nationalisation on the basis of the Civil Service.

I am perfectly aware that pilots object to a salary, but why I do not know. If pilots had a fixed salary they would know what their income was. At present, under the Act, you are not allowed to earn over a certain amount or you get a cut in your rates, but your remuneration can dwindle until it becomes a mere pittance and you have no guaranteed benefits or pension.

I am now throwing this great matter open to debate and this Conference must give its Executive a clear decisive mandate regarding what action to take, so that it can get into discussions with the Chamber of Shipping, because after all, pilotage and pilotage dues directly interest only two bodies—shipowners and pilots. If I were a young pilot with my present experience I would go wholeheartedly for nationalisation, if a change had to be.

THE PILOTS' CHARTER

Mr. Goldsmith: In considering problems of post-war pilotage we must have regard to the report of the Executive Committee meeting at which the matter was discussed. Perhaps one of the most important features of that discussion was the insistence given to the statement that a change *must* come, and that the pilots must, therefore, in their own interests, formulate a plan themselves to mould the details of that change. There also appeared to be some comment—even criticism—on the lines that the ports did not appear to realise a change must come. It would, I think, be reasonable to suggest that all this would fairly represent the case if the initiative for a change had originated with the pilots.

The pilots were asked to express their opinions upon the four points in the letter from the Ministry. If these opinions show that a majority are opposed to any change, and are unwilling to take the initiative to bring about a change, it seems hardly fair to expect them to produce constructive plans for a change they do not want. The position would be simplified if we had more evidence of what the Minister has in mind as desirable revision of the Act.

The Gravesend Channel pilots have given careful consideration to para. 5 of the Minister's letter, and note that he "is inclined to the view that some revision of the Act of 1913 would be desirable."

What has been the pilots' first reaction to this? It has been a somewhat natural one, a certain suspicion that, the initiative coming from that quarter, the result is hardly likely to be one calculated to be of unqualified benefit to the pilots.

At our last Conference we were given to understand that the Chamber of Shipping were then considering matters, but that no Authority or Ministry had made any proposal. What has occurred since then? Would it not appear that the views of the Chamber of Shipping had been adopted by the M.O.W.T. and are now sponsored by the Ministry?

Many pilots may take the view that, not only have they themselves not taken the initiative, but that it would be dangerous to their interest even to signify their agreement to the Pilotage Act being amended. They probably fear that by doing so they might give the shipowners the opportunity of saying: "Ah, these people are not satisfied with their Act, now is our opportunity to re-organise matters to our benefit."

Turning to the four points in the letter I submit that (a), (c) and (d) are matters which are capable of adjustment or amendment without amendment of the Act (by bye-law within the Act). I will admit that we, in London, do not always see eye to eye with our Authority, and frequently experience some difficulty in obtaining satisfaction in our requests. Much good work has been done in this direction, however, frequently with the able assistance of this Association, mainly in the person of Sir John Inskip.

So far as (b) is concerned the first point to interest the pilots is "status." Sir John has said that status is indefinable. It is perhaps fair to say that in this case it may be assumed that status refers to the system of remuneration, rather than to our position in the social or financial scale of seafarers. The suggestion is that, instead of being casual labourers on piecework (or professional gentlemen remunerated by a scale of professional charges), pilots should become the salaried servants of some organisation, either central or local.

DANGER OF REGIMENTATION

In becoming the salaried servants of some local bodies the pilots would suspect that their status might also be affected in such far reaching matters as certain liberties hitherto

enjoyed within the scope of bye-laws under the Act. There is the danger of regimentation. It is also possible that an attempt might be made to lower the existing standard of qualifications for pilots. It would appear that, in the interests of pilots throughout the country, the aim should be at least to maintain the existing standard, if not to raise it, even if for no other reason than to have a powerful lever in negotiations.

Pilots views on post-war problems must, of necessity, be largely local and sectional, but one aspect must surely be fairly general. Salaried occupations are, to a great extent, of a routine character, the work regulated by hours of labour, extra hours being compensated by the payment of overtime. The services of pilots at most ports are anything but routine.

The system of payment for extra services, and complicated schedules of rates as in London, have been described as cumbersome and incapable of working fairly. In London the variety of services that may be required of a pilot is so wide that it is only fair that many of them be recompensed beyond the common basis of employment.

It has been said that it is no use any port getting on its hind legs and saying "No change," but if that is a port's considered opinion, how can it honestly depart from it without knowing in which direction? Let us know the details of any change desired by the Ministry—or other organisation—and we can consider how to deal with the situation.

The pilots have learned to look upon the Pilotage Act of 1913 as their charter, and fear that by consenting to its revision on so large a scale as suggested in section (b) of the M.O.W.T. letter, they may be chasing the shadow for the substance.

A general discussion followed and the following are some of the points from the speeches:

Mr. Fernie: Nationalisation is no good and we cannot go on a salary. I would rather have what we have on the Clyde than a Central Authority.

Mr. Innes: The pilot to-day has power and opportunity to stand on his two legs and be independent, which is something very well worth preserving.

Mr. Williams: All grievances can be adjusted by bye-laws without altering the Act.

Mr. Windass: Why in the middle of this, the greatest war in history, is it suddenly decided that they want sweeping changes in pilotage? I have found that the shipowner when he wants changes, wants them all on his own side. Pilotage is piecework and I don't see any other way of paying for it. For every fault in the Act there are 100 good points.

CINQUE PORTS' VIEWS

Mr. Maltby: While in sympathy with the desire of the small ports for a fixed salary, I see no advantage to them inasmuch as the time may come when the trade of their

respective ports may increase and they would then have little rest or leisure. On the other hand, should the trade of those ports fall off, then some of the pilots would be stood off to enable the remainder to earn the standard fixed salary; that is a risk they should or would have to guard against. Apart from this there is always the grave risk of dissension among themselves through one or two pilots not pulling their weight in handling the traffic of the port. This latter point would probably be more pronounced in the larger ports.

I, on behalf of the Cinque Ports' pilots, deprecate the change-over from a tariff to a fixed salary as by accepting it a pilot would lose his freedom and status and become more or less a servant of the shipowner and no longer a specialist in his profession. The present system of tariff and payment to the pilot according to the vessel he conducts results in the station being well supplied with pilots. It is based on the principle of no work, no pay.

A Central Authority would be beneficial to all the ports but this question requires skilful handling. It could only be worked by splitting the kingdom into sections which would be answerable to the Central Authority wherever that may be found. We of the Cinque Ports decidedly wish to remain on our pre-war regulations and tariff.

Mr. Pead: Why must a change take place and who suggested it? Our London friends apparently don't want to be bothered with small tonnage, we can say it has been the salvation of our livelihood in the Bristol Channel. We have set up a committee of the Bristol Channel Authorities and are now discussing some sort of plan. One of the things put forward is compulsory pilotage.

Mr. Goldsmith: I should like to give whole-hearted support to non-compulsory ports to become compulsory but that can be done without wholesale amendment of the Act.

OPENING OF THE ACT NOT DEFINITE

When Mr. Elven asked it it were definite that the Act was to be opened, the Secretary replied "We are not at all sure. There is no ground for the suggestion that it has been decided that there must be a change—there is no compulsion. The shipowners are considering it in response to the invitation of the Ministry of War Transport and you are considering it in response to the same invitation."

The Chairman followed Sir John with the assurance "If you decide against a change the Executive will fight tooth and nail against a change."

Mr. Elven asked the Secretary: "Suppose other parties say they want the Act opened they would make proposals. Would you be advised?"

Sir John: Yes, most certainly.

Mr. Elven: There is no reason why you should make yours before the other side make theirs?

Sir John: Not at all.

Mr. Jones thought the discussion was going a bit "hay wire" and the Chamber of Shipping was now being brought in. The Ministry had only asked the views on four points.

Mr. Watson: Compulsory pilotage is a vital matter in these small ports.

Mr. Day: The Cinque Ports are not against compulsory pilotage in any port. We would do all in our power to assist any port when it was desirable.

Mr. Mock: It is obviously developing into a competition between the haves and the have nots. There are ports which want no change and the smaller ports have decided they want a change—obviously there must be a change if they are going to become compulsory. Regarding (d) we were forced to sell our boat.

The Secretary suggested that somebody should propose:

"That subject to the replies of Conference to the four questions in the Ministry of War Transport's letter of June 25th, 1943, to be discussed later, this Association desires no revision of the Pilotage Act or change in the administration of pilotage under the Act."

Sir John pointed out that if they were going for general compulsory pilotage it meant an amendment of the Act.

Mr. Goldsmith associated Gravesend Channel with the resolution and moved its adoption. Mr. Eagle seconded and it was carried.

FOR GENERAL COMPULSORY PILOTAGE

The second stage of Sir John's suggestion was then taken. The first point in the Ministry's letter was:

(a) Whether the present system of compulsory pilotage in some ports, and in parts of others, is still desirable.

Mr. Clare moved and Mr. Phillips seconded: "That this Conference instructs the Executive to take every step in their power to obtain general compulsory pilotage."

This was adopted.

AGAINST A CENTRAL AUTHORITY

The second point was:

(b) Whether pilots should retain their present status or should become the regular employees of some central body or local bodies.

Mr. Bennett regretted that the Executive had no definition of the Central Authority, its composition or its financial aspect. At Barry they had had several meetings but could never arrive at any conclusion because they had no concrete information. Who was going to pay for this administration in the event of a change? If pilotage was going to be pooled on a national basis what would be the average per man? Moreover, they did not know enough about conditions all over the kingdom to make any general recommendation.

"Let us stand up and face the people who are calling for a change. What is their objective?" said Mr. Bennett. He went on to urge the Association through Sir John should undertake an inquiry into the affairs of all the ports in order to get a comprehensive survey of the situation.

Sir John intervened in the discussion to get rid of all suspicion and said any idea that the shipowners were promoting all this discussion was sheer imagination. There were no grounds for any of these suspicions. All the Ministry had said was that if the shipowners and pilots agreed, after 30 years' experience of the Act, that they would like a change and could agree on what lines, then there would be a possibility that an agreed measure might be introduced into Parliament soon after the end of the war. Conference had decided against an agreed measure; and matters would therefore remain as they were presumably. It seemed likely that for a few years after the war there would be such a mass of legislation that there would be little or no chance of getting a Pilotage Bill before Parliament.

Concern about the possibility of the Flag Officer taking compulsory pilotage off when hostilities ceased was expressed by Mr. Hughes.

Mr. Sparrow thought they should ask for more information before coming to a decision but the Chairman said he did not know where they could get it. No one would commit himself, especially a Government department, to any specific promise or guarantee.

Mr. Akerman contended that although the Conference had passed the "no change" resolution it was subject to the answers given to the four points in the Ministry's letter and the question "Do you want a change?" had automatically come before them again. The Isle of Wight Inward men were comparatively young and they were not satisfied with their status. They had had ups and downs and at one period arrived at a stage where their current incomes would not pay the previous year's income tax. Although that was due to war conditions the fact remained that a young man with a family had never been able to enjoy a period of prosperity. While wishing to retain their professional status they wanted some security and were in favour of being attached to a central body at a salary commensurate with the services they rendered.

Eventually Mr. Line moved and Mr. Donkin seconded:

"That a pilot retain his present status as a licenced pilot and not become an employee of any body whether local or central."

This was carried.

Mr. Burn then proposed and Mr. Fernie seconded:

"That a central authority is not desired."

To this an amendment was moved by Mr. Davies (Swansea) seconded by Mr. Akerman:

"That this Association favours the setting up of a central pilotage authority under an amended Pilotage Act with a guaranteed minimum remuneration."

The amendment was defeated and Mr. Burn's resolution was adopted.

SICKNESS BENEFIT AND PENSIONS

The third point was then discussed:

(c) Whether the present system of payments to and from Benefit Funds needs review.

Mr. Line said that the answer was definitely "yes" and he spoke not only on behalf of London but also the outports. It had come to light that their fund was not on an actuarial basis but it was desirable that it should be. Some ports paid in a considerable amount of poundage but their premiums were defined by bye-laws and even when they paid as much as some ports of London their pensions did not increase. That needed looking into. The central committee were going to pursue, after the war, the relationship of the Pilot Fund and the Pilot Benefit Fund. The pilots paid 6d. in the £1 which might cover a multitude of sins. It was intended to endeavour to reverse the relationship and put the Benefit Fund in the position of calling on the Pilot Fund for its commitments.

Mr. Goldsmith associated himself with Mr. Line's remarks.

The Chairman said that many ports had no benefit fund. He thought it should be said from the Conference that the benefits were inadequate and in places where there were no funds they should be established.

Mr. Grafton mentioned that at Dundee the Benefit Fund covered dependants and that was one point Conference should keep in mind.

Mr. Maltby moved:

"That in the view of this Conference all ports should have an adequate sickness benefit and pension fund."

Mr. Sparrow seconded and it was carried unanimously.

OWNERSHIP OF PILOT BOATS

Lastly there was this fourth point:

(d) Whether pilot boats should continue to be privately owned or should be taken over by Pilotage Authorities and maintained by them.

"We could argue from now until Christmas on it," was the comment of Mr. Windass when the discussion had gone on some time. "We come from different ports and it must be thrashed out between the pilots," he added, and moved this resolution:

"That owing to the diversity of conditions existing at different ports it is quite impossible for this Association to answer this question. It is a matter to be decided between the pilots of each port and their Authority."

This was seconded by Mr. Slade and carried.

During the discussion preceding this decision the following were some of the points made by speakers:

Mr. Davies (Swansea): The Ministry is determined the Authorities should own the cutters.

Mr. Jones: We have run our boats fairly successfully for many years. If the authorities

take over the running of pilot boats the pilots should have some say in the running to see that it is done economically.

Mr. Goldsmith: We are working under a deed some 90 years old. We have run the boats and maintained an efficient service. True, recently we have sought the assistance of the shipowners and have been granted a small boarding and landing fee which shows that the shipowners are quite happy that we should run it.

Mr. Elven: The Pilotage Authorities are responsible under the Act to supply the cutters. That has led to considerable conflict in the past.

Mr. Smith: The shipowner gets the service much cheaper when it is run by the pilots.

The Secretary: The position of Gravesend is peculiar. The objection the Chamber of Shipping have is that in certain ports where the cutters have got into financial difficulties substantial profits have been made in the past; the cutter companies have paid out and reduced their capital. The point is whether the Association stands for ownership of pilot cutters for profit-making.

SUBSCRIPTIONS OF PILOTS ON ACTIVE SERVICE

The subject of the subscription of men on active service was introduced by the Chairman, and the Secretary said the point was put to Conference because of letters he had received asking whether those pilots should be asked for subscriptions. The answer was that if they continued to hold their licences it was presumed that they would wish to retain their membership and they could properly be asked to pay. If they did not hold their licences the Association had no right to demand subscriptions from them.

Mr. Akerman pointed out that a good number of those who had laid down their licences and hoped to come back to pilotage would be delighted and honoured if allowed to retain their membership even if it was contrary to the rules.

Conference then adjourned for lunch and on re-assembling proceeded with the election of officers.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS THE PRESIDENCY

The Chairman said it was no use looking for a President at present and they must carry on without one. There was always the Parliamentary Committee for them to call on if necessity arose.

Mr. WEBB RE-ELECTED

Conference had no two minds about the senior vice-presidency and promptly re-elected Mr. Webb on the proposition of Mr. Phillips seconded by Mr. Ramsey.

"As long as you want me I will do my best however feeble it is!" Mr. Webb replied.

Mr. J. H. A. SMITH A VICE-PRESIDENT

The Secretary reported a letter from Mr. Richardson saying he was quite unable to attend Conference and he thought he had better resign. "I asked him to leave himself in the hands of Conference," added Sir John.

Mr. J. H. A. Smith and Mr. Richardson were proposed for the other vice-presidency, the former by Mr. Catton seconded by Mr. Elven, and the latter by Mr. Grafton seconded by Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Smith was elected and in reply said that while he thanked Conference for the honour, he felt a bit awkward in the absence of Mr. Richardson and had been no party to his own name being put forward.

Mr. Sparrow expressed appreciation of the services Mr. Richardson had rendered.

LADY APSLEY AND CAPT. COOMBS HON. VICE-PRESIDENTS

As his first duty as a vice-president Mr. Smith claimed the privilege of moving the appointment of Lady Apsley as an hon. vice-president and the sending of a message of greeting from the Conference.

Remarking that the late Lord Apsley was "a great man to us," Mr. Hughes seconded.

The Chairman moved that Capt. Coombs be invited to become an hon. vice-president, Mr. Davies (Swansea) seconded.

Both motions were cordially accepted.

SECRETARY AND SOLICITOR

Mr. Line in proposing the re-election of Sir John Inskip as Secretary and Solicitor said "He has never let us down."

Mr. Mock, who seconded, amused Conference by saying "We have thrown a few bricks and it is nice to think we have someone thick skinned enough not to run out when they are thrown."

"I don't know what we would do without him," said Mr. Webb in putting the proposal to Conference which adopted it with enthusiasm.

Sir John said if he were not assured of their confidence he would not carry on. "Perhaps I do not please everybody," he added, "I am not here to do that, but to tell you what I think to be in your interests. Directly you find yourselves wishing to appoint a full-time Secretary with an office and staff of your own, and have found the right man, so far from meeting opposition from me you will have my encouragement and fullest support. You can always regard me as one of your best friends."

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Rule 11 provides that the three members of the Executive who have been longest in office must retire. Two of these were Mr. J. J. Jones and Mr. J. A. Sparrow. The latter decided not to stand again. The other retiring member was Mr. J. Stanley Ayre, Mr. H. B. Eagle, who had been elected with him in 1939, having been successful in the draw at the Executive meeting on the eve of

the Conference. There were six other nominations to the Executive, and a fourth vacancy was created by the election of Mr. Smith to a vice-presidency. The ballot resulted:

Mr. Frank R. E. Goldsmith	33 votes
Mr. J. J. Jones	32 "
Mr. C. E. Mock	22 "
Mr. J. Stanley Ayre	21 "

Mr. James H. Innes	18 votes
Mr. John P. Bennett	17 "
Mr. E. T. Day	16 "
Mr. William Hughes	8 "

The first three thanked the Conference. (Mr. Ayre was abroad and could not attend).

The Chairman impressed on the newcomers that they did not represent any district but the pilots in general. There was a busy year ahead of them. He thought the Association's gratitude to Mr. Richardson should be recorded on the minutes—"a good solid man who spoke in a friendly way and was not afraid to speak."

"THE PILOT"

The editor of *The Pilot* was re-appointed on the proposition of Mr. Maltby seconded by Mr. Catton. In reply Mr. Curthoys referred to his long and happy association with the pilots and invited their co-operation as contributors to the magazine.

Messrs. Watling, Parker & Co. were re-appointed auditors on the motion of Mr. Mock.

TRUSTEES

The Chairman explained that the trustees held their appointments until such time as they were removed.

NEXT CONFERENCE

The Chairman said that the date and place of the next Conference must be left to the Executive. If an emergency Conference were necessary it would be called.

Conference agreed.

CALL UP OF PILOTS

Mr. Line called attention to a notice from Trinity House which had been put up in the room of the London Sea and River Pilots regarding the call up of pilots and asked if any other port had received a similar notice. Some delegates replied that there had been a communication on the matter.

The Secretary did not think the Association could oppose the taking of a pilot simply because he was a pilot. It might be the case that a port was practically or altogether closed; and again the calling of a young pilot to serve in the Merchant Navy could not be opposed if the pilotage service could spare him. The time to tackle the matter was when the authorities took the next step and called up a pilot. He assumed that Mr. Line would like the Association to oppose any de-reservation of pilots as a class and that could be done.

OFFICE OF THE U.K.P.A.

Ideas for Reorganisation and Meeting the Cost

Attention was again directed to the urgent need of an assistant for Sir John Inskip by Mr. Catton who was anxious to give notice of motion on the subject. There was some discussion in the course of which Mr. Line quoted the resolution passed at the 1942 Conference to which Mr. Smith replied that the matter was discussed by the Executive, but naturally they had to take Sir John's views into consideration.

Bound up with this were the questions of a central office in London and adequate means, the acid test as Mr. Catton called it. "We all appreciate the work the Association is doing for us," he said, "and it would be no hardship to most of us to increase our annual subscription to the level of associations of a similar description." He suggested that they might find a way of assisting the few pilots at those ports where they could not face the increase.

Subscriptions based on the earnings of the previous year were suggested by Mr. Jones and Mr. Davies (Swansea) put the figure at 10s. per £100.

Mr. Line saw difficulty at the ports where the earnings had been considerably curtailed by the war if the subscription was increased and thought the matter should be referred to the ports.

Sir John said that the subscription was only sufficient under the existing working arrangement. He suggested that the Executive would have to draw up a budget and provide for an income for an Association re-organised with an office of its own. He also reminded Conference that a great deal of the work was of a legal nature and it was necessary to employ a solicitor.

Mr. Catton suggested that the idea of insurance should also be taken into consideration.

In the end the Chairman undertook that the Executive would again go into the matter. He estimated that if they separated the positions again they would need £1,500 a year to provide an office, secretary and staff and a further substantial sum for legal expenses.

Conference accepted the Chairman's undertaking.

SMALL PORTS AND EXECUTIVE REPRESENTATION

Mr. Davies (Swansea) gave notice to move at the next Conference that no port should have more than one representative on the Executive Committee and to raise the question of representation for the small ports.

Conference passed a vote of thanks to the Chairman proposed by Mr. Line, and seconded by Mr. Catton, and came to an end on a happy note when Mr. Webb confessed that one of the drawbacks of his life was that he had always been too shy and too modest!

WHAT THE U.K.P.A. WOULD GAIN BY FEDERATION

By D. J. DAVIES, SWANSEA

Promptly acting on the suggestion made by the Editor at the Conference, Mr. D. J. Davies of Swansea sent him the following article on the question of federation. It is, of course, a purely personal expression of opinion by an individual pilot.

The modern tendency is for whole bodies to combine, especially in the political, the industrial, and the commercial spheres for the avowed intention of increasing their power and influence. The political parties, Shipping Federation, T.U.C., trusts and combines, are a few examples of what I mean.

Numerically the U.K.P.A. is far too small to pursue an energetic programme, and this inherent weakness is reflected by the defection of many working pilots. An increase in subscription, though necessary and long overdue, would not of itself produce the needed power. It is numbers that count every time whether in the House of Commons or on the battlefield.

At Conference the general impression was that most delegates had not gone deeply into this matter of affiliation and consequently were unaware of the many advantages of such a step. At the moment several working pilots are members contributing both to the U.K.P.A. and the Navigators. Better benefits are provided by the latter. For example, I will refer only to the protection given for the cancellation or suspension of either a Board of Trade certificate or a pilot's licence. This cover provides monthly payments (maximum £50 per month for eight months) during suspension, also a maximum compensation of £1,000 for cancellation of a ticket or licence. On top of this the usual legal defence costs are included. Should, however, affiliation take place it will serve no useful purpose for pilots to belong to both bodies. Then doubtless, the U.K.P.A. will incorporate such benefits supported by increased subscriptions from members.

The Officers' (Merchant Navy) Federation is the proper body to link up with as it represents that community of the merchant marine of which pilotage is a part.

The U.K.P.A. would retain its individuality and be responsible for its own management and salvation, freedom of action therefore being guaranteed.

The U.K.P.A. would be represented on the Council of the Federation.

The U.K.P.A. could withdraw from the Federation at any time.

The cost of affiliation is nominal. Protection through mutual support would be attained.

There is much speculation to-day on post-war reconstruction. What about pilotage? I have a feeling that changes here are impending too. Is the profession ready for some reorganisation in exchange for better "status"? After all, reconstruction simply means greater efficiency. Time marches on and no body, not even pilots, can afford to lag behind.

Some time back our able vice-president, Mr. Webb, wrote an excellent article for *The Pilot* under the tantalising title "What's your course, pilot?" Affiliation answers it partly, at least I am convinced that it indicates the first course to take on the long voyage to the haven of security.

Messages from the New Hon. Vice-Presidents

When the Secretary communicated the invitation of Conference to Lady Apsley and Capt. Coombs he received the following replies:

"It is as a great honour that I write to accept the pilots' invitation to become an Honorary Vice-President of the U.K.P.A. in memory of my husband's association with them. Viola Apsley."

"Needless to say I deem this a very great honour and have very much pleasure in accepting. William H. Coombs."

Greetings from the Officers

In the cordial address he made at the luncheon on the opening day of Conference, Capt. Coombs, as President of the Officers Federation, conveyed to the pilots the greetings, good wishes and warm admiration of the shipmasters and officers of the affiliated associations.

"None can know better than the officers who take the ships to sea," he said, "the quiet and almost unknown services of pilots in these parts, and indeed throughout the world. I am sure you will appreciate a word of greetings from the masters and officers you know so well and have a shrewd assessment of their service, while they in turn know what services the pilots are rendering to the war effort."

"I wish you continued success in your Association."

Obituary

THE EARL OF BATHURST who died on September 21st at Cirencester Park was the father of the late Lord Apsley whose son succeeds to the earldom. The late earl was a well-known authority on foxhunting and for 56 years held the mastership of the Vale of the White Horse Hunt.

Mr. JOSEPH KING for many years an Hon. Vice-President of the U.K.P.A. died on August 25th, aged 83. He was Liberal M.P. for North Somerset from 1910 to 1918.

Mr. LEWIS JONES, while piloting a ship up the Mersey on October 6th, was taken seriously ill and died before the ship was docked. For many years Mr. Jones was prominent in the affairs of the U.K.P.A. and was a member of the Executive Committee from 1921 to 1932. He was nominated at several subsequent Conferences but failed to obtain election.

Vice-Presidents :

MR. BERNARD C. WEBB, Broomfield, Lamdash, Isle of Arran, Scotland
 MR. J. H. A. SMITH, Pilot Office, 18, Queen's Terrace, Southampton

Executive Committee :

MR. J. J. JONES, 41, The Parade, Cardiff
 MR. J. STANLEY AYRE, 42, Trajan Avenue, South Shields
 MR. M. M. MARSHALL, 26, Trajan Street, South Shields
 MR. J. A. SPARROW, 139, Newark Street, Greenock
 MR. ALEXANDER A. LOVE, 32, Falkland Street, Hyndland, Glasgow, W.2
 MR. H. B. EAGLE, "Feild View," Wilton Road, Southampton
 MR. G. W. WINDASS, 66, Whitehall Road, Gravesend, Kent
 MR. F. S. CHESTERFIELD, 102, Etherington Road, Hull.

Local Secretaries :

Aberdeen	J. M. Wyness2, Belvedere Crescent, Aberdeen
Ardrossan	J. A. Cunningham	The Harbour, Ardrossan, Ayrshire
Barrow-in-Furness	William Taylor23, West Avenue, Barrow-in-Furness
Barry	C. CarpenterPilotage Office, Barry
Belfast	A. G. StarkeyPilot Office, Clarendon Dock, Belfast
Blyth	W. T. Carr51, Ridley Avenue, Blyth
Bo'ness	D. McAlister"Asgog," Grahmsdyke Road, Bo'ness
Boston, Lincs.	H. FountainPilot Office, Custom House Quay, Boston, Lincs.
Bristol	S. J. Ray"Hillboro'," Elberton Road, Westbury Lane
Burntisland	L. McAlisterThe Pilot House, The Docks, Burntisland
Cardiff	D. Edgar Morris13, Woodland Place, Penarth, Glam.
Clyde (Gourock)	J. H. Innes"Burnbrae," Victoria Road, Gourock
Cinque Ports	E. T. DayChannel Pilots' Room, Royal Terrace Pier,
Colchester	H. C. Chamberlain	64, Spring Road, Brightlingsea [Gravesend
Dartmouth	R. GatziasPilots Watch Hse., 3, Bayard's Cove, Dartmouth
Dee	T. Bennett7, Railway Terrace, Connah's Quay, Nr. Chester
Dundee	N. Dew"St. Olaf," 268, Broughty Ferry Road, Dundee
Falmouth	E. LudlowPilot Boat Association, 14, Arwenak Street
Fleetwood	A. Wright12, Arthur Street, Fleetwood [Falmouth
Fowey	James SaltSeaside Cottage, Polruan, Cornwall
Glasgow	A. A. Love32, Falkland Street, Glasgow, W.2
Gloucester	L. C. TaylorPilotage Office, Sharpness, Gos.
Goole	T. M. Mapplebeck	45, Salisbury Avenue, Goole
Grangemouth	M. I. H. SmithThe Docks, Grangemouth
Gravesend (River)	J. H. FifeClare House, 24, Singlewell Road, Gravesend
Gravesend (Sea)	W. J. Glassborow	76, Central Avenue, Gravesend
Hartlepool	J. T. Nicholson70, Church Street, West Hartlepool
Harwich	T. R. R. Letten"Rivington," Fronck's Road, Dovercourt
Holyhead	William Owen8, Hibernia Row, Holyhead
Hull	L. Walford35, Glencoe Street, Anlaby Road, Hull
Ipswich	G. A. Gardiner15, Ruskin Road, Ipswich
Isle of Wight (Inw'd)	L. W. Akerman"Craig-y-don," Princes Esplanade, Cowes
Isle of Wight (Out'd)	J. H. A. SmithPilot Office, 18, Queen's Terrace, Southampton
King's Lynn	C. T. Chase37, Park Avenue, King's Lynn
Leith	J. P. Short"Braco," 164, Granton Road, Edinburgh, 5
Llanelly	W. Hughes8, Union Terrace, Llanelly
Londonderry	C. O'DonnellPilot Station, Innishowen Head, Co. Donegal
Lowestoft	J. Riches"Kingston," Walmer Road, South Lowestoft
Methil	J. R. Davidson"Glen Goval," Macdonald Street, Methil
Middlesbrough	L. Pickersgill6, Phillida Terrace, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough
Milford Haven	T. H. Roberts4, Hill Street, Hakin, Pembrokeshire
Neath	W. J. Jenkins"Fernleigh," Baglan, Briton Ferry, Neath
Newhaven	E. W. Chidgey"Quantock," Hillcrest, Newhaven, Sussex
Newport (Mon.)	C. J. Page1, Caerau Road, Newport, Mon.
Plymouth	E. Rogers43, Woolster Street, Plymouth
Poole	W. Brown"Elgar," 28, Hermitage Road, Parkstone
Portsmouth	R. R. Russell10, Dolphin Court, Craneswater Gardens, S'thsea
Port Talbot	H. A. Gunn5, Adare Street, Port Talbot
Preston	H. HalsallPilotage Office, The Docks, Preston, Lancs.
St. Ives	W. H. Treloar14, Barnoon Terrace, St. Ives
Sheerness	P. J. Hannan113, Minster Road, Sheerness
Shoreham	A. J. Blaker"Braeside," Old Rectory Gardens, Southwick
South Shields	R. MarshallPilot Office, South Shields (Sussex)
Sunderland	R. Wilkinson"Cordova," Park Lea Road, Roker, Sunderland
Swansea	S. J. HansonPilot House, West Pier, Swansea
Trent	Robert Acaster30, Cranbrook Avenue, Hull
Whitehaven	T. H. StevensonBridge Hse., Netherton, Maryport, Cumberland
Wisbech	J. P. Burton35, Custom House St., Sutton Bridge, Wisbech
Yarmouth	F. Armstrong66, Victoria Road, Gorleston-on-Sea, Yarmouth