

The Pilot

(OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS' ASSOCIATION)

No. 2. Vol. 35

December, 1956

IN THIS ISSUE

EARNINGS

END OF THE TALKS

POSITION REPORTED TO THE MINISTER
OF TRANSPORT

JOINT MEETINGS OF PILOTS



U.K.P.A. 69th CONFERENCE



CLYDE INQUIRY

Head Office of the Association :

SHANNON COURT, CORN STREET, BRISTOL

C. D. GRIFFITHS, O.B.E., D.F.C., General Secretary and Solicitor
to whom all communications are to be addressed

OFFICERS FOR
1956-1957 of the

United Kingdom Pilots' Association

President :

CAPTAIN SIR PETER MACDONALD, K.B.E., M.P

Honorary Vice-Presidents :

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

LADY APSLEY

J. H. A. SMITH, Esq.

SIR IRVING ALBERY

MAJOR JAMES BURNIE

ALEX A. LOVE, Esq.

BERNARD C. WEBB, Esq.

Vice-Presidents :

D. H. TATE (Tees), 266, Acklam Road, Middlesbrough

H. J. WYNN (London River), 52, Malvina Avenue, Gravesend.

Trustees :

C. CATTON (London River)

H. G. PEAD (Cardiff)

Honorary Treasurer :

H. J. WYNN.

Executive Committee :

J. H. INNES (Clyde), 20, Elie Street, Glasgow, W.2.

M. M. MARSHALL (Tyne), 8, Vespasian Street, South Shields.

L. R. SLADE (Cardiff), 111, Windsor Road, Penarth.

W. E. SPENCER (Cinque Ports), The Knoll, Archers Court, Whitfield, near Dover.

D. GRAINGER (Humber), 39, Link Road, Cottingham, E. Yorks.

D. MAIN, Ashtower, 22, Victoria Road, Gourock.

S. GREEN, 63, Furness Park Road, Barrow-in-Furness.

F. V. JAMES (Southampton), Surnise, Lakewood Road, Chandlers Ford, Hants.

R. B. PAGE (Channel), Channel Pilots' Office, Royal Terrace Pier, Gravesend.

Finance Committee :

THE TWO VICE-PRESIDENTS AND L. R. SLADE

Auditor :

J. B. WATLING, F.C.A., (MESSRS. WATLING, AND PARTNERS, Bristol).

General Secretary and Solicitor :

C. D. GRIFFITHS, O.B.E., D.F.C., Shannon Court, Corn Street, Bristol 1.

Editor of "The Pilot" :

ALFRED CURTHOYS, 79, Gloucester Road, S.W.7 (FRemantle 0500)

EARNINGS—the talks end.

IT will be remembered that on the occasion of the meeting in September last of representatives of all pilots of the United Kingdom, a report was given of the position as it then existed of the protracted negotiations with the shipowners to find a suitable yardstick or formula, which both parties felt could be recommended for general application in fixing the level of earnings in every District throughout the country, subject only to the few exceptional ports which all recognised would call for individual consideration and treatment.

At that time, Mr. O'Leary and Mr. Griffiths were about to have a further talk with representatives of the shipowners, in an endeavour to bridge the gap which still divided the parties. On the pilots' side it was felt that all the concessions had been made by them, and if only the owners would come a little way from the stand they had originally taken (and from which they have never moved) an acceptable settlement on a fair basis to all concerned was within our grasp, although admittedly at levels in many instances substantially less than the pilots felt justified in claiming.

The meeting at the Chamber duly took place in an atmosphere both of cordiality and realism. On behalf of the pilots it was made perfectly clear that if agreement was to be reached it was imperative that the industry should abandon the stand hitherto taken and offer figures known to be more in keeping with appropriate Merchant Service salaries for representative vessels.

An assurance was given by the Chamber that the need for urgent action was recognised, and it was intimated that the matter would be brought before a meeting of their Council then about to take place with a promise to report the result during the week commencing October 15. No letter having arrived, several reminders were given, and on November 2, 1956, a letter was sent by the Chamber of Shipping to both bodies of pilots in the following terms :—

"... The meeting of shipowners on the 12th October enabled my Executive to make substantial progress in obtaining the views of the industry on the position reached in the informal discussions which we have had. It was, however, necessary for us to take our consultations a little further before we could feel that we were in a position to give you a representative and considered opinion on behalf of shipowners on the proposals put forward on behalf of the pilots in the course of those discussions. This I am now able to do.

"In the first place I want to assure you that, in the consultations that have taken place within the industry, all the points and submissions advanced by the pilots' representatives in support of their proposals were fully explained. As we had expected, the first obstacle we encountered was the introduction into the formula we had explored with you on the "entry point" ship based on notional sizes rather than on the size of ship actually using the port with the result, as we know, that on a number of cases the resultant notional figures bore no relation to reality. This in itself, however, might not have led to insuperable difficulty had it not been for two fundamental considerations.

"The first of these is that the scale of earnings proposed by the pilots, particularly if applied rigidly as we understand that the pilots insist that it should be, would result in the remuneration of pilots in many districts being at least equal to, and in a number of cases greater than, the earnings of masters. In our talks with you and in the press reports of the recent Annual Conference of the United Kingdom Pilots' Association, it has become apparent that the pilots are only prepared to accept the sea service as a guide to their earnings if the resultant earnings are not less than those of masters. Our consultations with shipowners have left us in no doubt that this is a concept which continues to be unacceptable to the industry.

"The second consideration arises from the fact that the stage we had reached in our discussions with you went no further than the contemplation of a scale of earnings for what for convenience we had described as "foreign going" ports. Shipowners mainly interested in small ports were strongly of the opinion that to apply to the "home trade" ports a scale which would be in effect a continuation of the scale for foreign going ports, based on your proposals, would involve increases of rates at the small ports which would be wholly inappropriate.

"Apart from these considerations, I must tell you quite frankly that shipowners—many of whom, as you will appreciate, are members of pilotage authorities—felt no assurance that your proposals, had they been acceptable to the industry, would necessarily have received the support of pilots generally or of the pilotage authorities which, of course, have the primary responsibility of regulating the rates, subject to the Ministry's approval. That there is an apparent lack of unanimity

among the pilots themselves is evidenced by the action of the Isle of Wight Outward pilots in dissociating themselves from the negotiations. Although I expect you have seen it, I enclose a copy of a letter dated 9th October, addressed to the Chamber on behalf of those pilots.

"In these circumstances, and so long as these fundamental differences remain, there seems no point in resuming negotiations. The next step therefore would seem to be that the position that has been reached should be reported to the Ministry, on the clear understanding that there is no disclosure of the figures of earnings put forward "without prejudice" by either side during our informal talks, to which figures, in the absence of agreement, the parties are of course in no way committed. . . ."

The letter referred to from the Southampton pilots was as follows:—

"... As we understand that the Chamber of Shipping is shortly to discuss the question of pilots' remuneration, the Southampton pilots wish to bring to the notice of all concerned that they have been in disagreement with the negotiations dealing with their remuneration as sponsored by the United Kingdom Pilots' Association since their inception and they have dissociated themselves entirely from any decision that has or may be taken in their name for the following reasons:

"The remuneration under the scheme does not recognise the difference in tonnage handled by the Outward and Inward Services which is in the proportion of two to one; similarly with acts of pilotage.

"This has been established by a difference in the remuneration between the senior Outward and junior Inward Services for the past fifty years and is a just recompense for the more responsible work performed by the senior pilots of the District when promoted from the Inward to the Outward Service in conformity with long established practice; this system having been satisfactory and beneficial to the shipping industry.

"In conclusion, it is a matter of disappointment that our Pilotage Authority has not been a party to any of these discussions as their counsel could well have benefited the negotiations. . . ."

As a consequence, emergency meetings of both bodies of pilots were immediately called and took place in London on Friday, November 23.

The morning sessions were held independently and in the afternoon there was a joint meeting on board *H.Q.S. Wellington*. The following were present:—

U.K.P.A. S. Green (*Barrow*), L. R. Slade (*Cardiff*), W. E. Spencer (*Cinque Ports*), J. H. Innes (*Clyde*), D. Grainger (*Humber*), R. B. Page (*London Channel*), H. J. Wynn (*London River*), F. V. Jones (*Southampton*), D. H. Tate (*Tees*), M. M. Marshall (*Tyne*), C. D. Griffiths, *General Secretary*.
T. & G.W.U. J. M. Bennett (*Barry*), A. Barron (*Blyth*), F. White and P. H. Withers (*Bristol*), R. P. Sanderson (*Dumdee*), D. G. Bingham and D. R. Herbert (*Liverpool*), R. T. Green and J. Lee (*Manchester*), T. E. England, W. Friend and J. H. Pearce (*Newport*), R. Hudson (*Seaham*), T. B. Meikle (*Reg. 7 Scotland*), J. Clement and B. Rees (*Swansea*), John J. Hartley and James Purvis (*Tyne*), H. Haughton (*Reg. 6 Waterways Officer*), T. O'Leary, *National Secretary, Docks Group*.

The joint meeting had before it the resolution adopted at the earlier meeting in September above referred to, which for convenience is set out below:—

"This joint representative body of all the pilots of the United Kingdom having heard the report on national negotiations regarding earnings, hereby resolve that failing satisfactory conclusion in the near future, a meeting of every pilot be held in London to consider the steps necessary to achieve their object."

The discussions which took place both during the morning and afternoon covered a full review of the progress of the negotiations and the action to be taken in the circumstances which had arisen. The gravity of the situation was emphasised by every speaker, as also was the strong sense of disillusionment universally felt at the failure, despite the patience and restraint exercised by so many pilots for so long, of the shipowners to submit any counter proposals or offer to increase a single figure before deciding to terminate the negotiations.

It was noted that the existence of a measure of disagreement with the general policy among a few ports was used as an added ground for regarding further discussion as unlikely to produce fruitful results, despite the fact that it has always been recognised by those directly concerned in the negotiations that for special and doubtless good reasons no formula was ever likely to meet the requirements of every case without exception. It has always been intended that those ports should be given individual consideration.

It seemed clear that it was intended to make full use of such differences as may exist and accordingly, in order to prevent any further attempt to exploit such a situation, it was agreed that the holding of a general meeting of all pilots to enable the position to be fully explained and understood, after a full opportunity for debate, could no longer be delayed. The following letter signed jointly by Mr. O'Leary and Mr. Griffiths was accordingly sent to the Ministry of Transport on November 24, 1956:—

"... We have been instructed to convey to the Minister, through your good self, the very deep concern and grave disappointment with which our entire memberships received the Chamber of Shipping's decision to break off the direct negotiations between us in the above matter which, as you know, have been very difficult and very protracted. Further that our members feel that it would be a tragedy if at this time it should appear that no alternative to direct action by them could assist them to further what in their opinion and in ours is a very just cause.

"The pilots also reaffirmed their previous decision to arrange a meeting or meetings to which every pilot in the United Kingdom would be invited in order that every pilot could have the opportunity to discuss the future policy which the joint bodies may recommend as necessary in pursuance and furtherance of their best interest. . . ."

All pilots will be kept closely advised as to details of the arrangements now to be made and further developments, as they arise.

THE U.K.P.A. CONFERENCE

The 69th Conference of the United Kingdom Pilots Association was held on board *H.Q.S. Wellington* on September 26 and 27. It was attended by:—

THE PRESIDENT Sir Peter Macdonald
VICE-PRESIDENTS D. H. Tate and H. J. Wynn.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE H. B. Eagle, J. H. Innes, M. M. Marshall, L. R. Slade, W. E. Spencer, J. P. Bennett, D. Grainger and D. Main.
HON. TREASURER Bernard C. Webb.

Delegates:

BELFAST F. J. Hurst.
CARDIFF W. L. Harris, T. Morgan, C. Catterson, T. C. Alexander.
CINQUE PORTS T. A. Jennings, J. A. Greenwood, H. A. Garner, R. W. Roberts, W. C. Duncan.
CLYDE J. C. Taylor, John E. Begg, K. Conway.
GRAVESEND CHANNEL R. B. Page, C. A. Levack, G. L. Baker, W. J. Glassborow, A. A. Holland.
GOOLE Harry Richman.
GREAT YARMOUTH C. Bewvey.
HUMBER C. E. Allman, W. D. Lowrey, J. Hardy, R. Sanderson, F. Berry.
ISLE OF WIGHT (Inward) P. C. Driver, J. A. L. Hughes, J. Radford.
KING'S LYNN C. T. Chase, James Leveritt.
LONDON NORTH CHANNEL K. Sutherland, D. Bunn, K. C. Davis, J. S. Anderson, F. Francis. (Second day: G. H. Jackson, W. S. Scott, E. Taylor, R. Whittler, H. Harris).
LONDON RIVER J. Cushnie, E. Hobbs, W. Holman, F. J. Fife, D. Birmingham.
MEDWAY C. E. Rhodes, G. H. Taylor.
PRESTON E. N. Chambers.
SHOREHAM T. W. N. Dalton, A. J. Blaker.
SOUTHAMPTON F. V. Janet, K. Hutchings, C. J. Pearce.
SUNDERLAND Stanley Hall, G. W. Gittins.
TEES F. Dixon, M. W. Challenor, J. Taylor, G. E. Coates, A. Stevenson.

MR. TATE welcomed the delegates and declared the Conference open.

The company rose for prayers led by MR. BERNARD WEBB.

MR. GRIFFITHS then read his report as General Secretary and Solicitor.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

AT the mere mention of the word "pilotage" the wary will at once begin to look round for the inevitable anomaly that must somewhere be closely associated with whatever the problem may be, and that perhaps is at least partly why, during the twelve months since last I reviewed the work of your Association, there has been a period of the most intensive and unremitting activity on the part of the Executive with unhappily little in the way of very practical results to report.

The problem, as you know, has been one of earnings and almost nothing else. This is disappointing enough for those who have toiled so hard, but nothing like so disappointing as it must be to you who, placing confidence in assurances so repeatedly given that satisfactory results must sooner or later crown the protracted negotiations which have gone on since last we all met, have loyally refrained from pressing claims so long overdue for substantial increases in rates. I know from letters I have received and responsible views frequently expressed both on and off the Executive Committee that many ports have already lost patience. Nevertheless, I would ask you to bear with me a little longer before finally abandoning our present course.

The first round has indeed gone to those, who throughout have been sceptical, and inevitably your Executive Committee is now coming in for a certain amount of criticism for having advocated a policy of restraint and the settlement of claims by direct negotiation according to the application of some agreed principle. The preliminary spade work has taken so long and progress been so woefully slow that we have, in some measure, been overtaken by events. We appear to have lost our place in the queue and once again time has been on the side of the shipowners, as economic conditions have deteriorated and Government policy has veered against wage increases or other measures savouring, however slightly, of inflation. All this is very largely true. Your Executive recognises that their task is not becoming simpler as time goes on and at first sight the prospect of achieving their objective appears to be diminishing.

It is in just such circumstances that I would urge upon you the necessity of refraining from rash decision and hasty action, and of maintaining confidence in your Committee who still have solid grounds for hoping that an eleventh hour solution may yet be found to our present difficulties and an acceptable method emerge of fixing earnings on a national basis in a manner fair and reasonable to pilots and shipowners alike, if not once and for all, at any rate until time can be found by the Government to appoint a Select Committee to enquire into and report upon the whole organisation and working of the pilotage system throughout the country. Those in

authority will not be found to be unreasonable or unfair. The forbearance of pilots while their representatives have devoted so much time and energy to seeking a solution to what is recognised as a highly complex problem will not have passed unnoticed, and you will not, in my view, have been prejudiced by having sought agreement even if in the end we fail to achieve it. After all, it is this Government which has promised a full and attractive reward for a job done well. Let us, therefore, devote our energies to qualifying for that claim.

Another matter which has been a cause of complaint in some quarters is the absence of adequate information as to the progress of events. Again the Committee recognise that there is considerable justification for this but the explanation has already been given in recent issues of *The Pilot*. The time has now come, however, when matters can be discussed more openly and it has always been the wish of the Executive that every member of this Association should be most fully informed as soon as they were free to do so. For that reason it may help and prove a convenience if I briefly recapitulate the position since last year, which, even if a little tedious to some, may possibly be appreciated by the large number of new members who have joined the Association in the meantime.

From time to time we find ourselves at the Ministry with pilots, Authority and shipowners, all in agreement that there should be an increase in rates, but completely and seriously divided as to the resultant level of net earnings it should produce. On other occasions, of course, there is total opposition to any increase at all.

Confronted with such a situation and with nothing else to act as a guide, the Minister up to now has been left to do as best he could in the light of such considerations as pre-war work and earnings, modern developments and changes in trade at the port, current traffic and trends, the increased cost of living and so forth. It is no disrespect to say that such a method tended to perpetuate anomalies and injustices and gave effect to no known formula. Moreover, the machinery of rate adjustments is both cumbersome and slow through no fault of anybody and any increase granted cannot be ante-dated to the lodging of the application. The whole system has become out-dated and there is general agreement that a serious effort should be made, in view of the virtual impossibility of legislative action, to put our own house in order.

The Port Grouping Scheme was this Association's contribution. It was designed to give a satisfactory level of earnings and, above all, a substantial measure of stability for both pilots and shipowners, and upon the instructions of Conference it became the broad basis

of the Association's policy on this question. The shipowners, equally anxious to work to a consistent principle, had for long been advocating the adoption of their Sea Service Scale, which you all know so well involved paying a pilot at a level somewhere between the master and mate of the average size of ship using the pilotage service in his District. All this is now past history. We have agreed to accept, *subject to proper safeguards*, the shipowners' yardstick—namely the Sea Service Scale. In it, we felt, lay the best opportunity of making an entirely fresh start and establishing the means for a complete re-assessment of pilots' remuneration.

You will have seen in the most recent publication of *The Pilot* that the level claimed for every port is not less than that of a master of that class of ship which truly represents a pilot's responsibilities. The first and vital step has, therefore, been to find the right ship, and that most complex and enormous task has been accomplished. The battle of the "representative ship" is over—settled by mutual agreement following perfect team work between Mr. Tate and Mr. Clement of the Union on the one hand and officials of the Chamber on the other, without whose patient and invaluable help this essential corner stone in the whole scheme would never have come into being. We should all be grateful for the co-operation and ready assistance received from the Chamber of Shipping and the Chairman of their Pilotage Committee in settling this abstruse problem.

I have called it an enormous task and so it was. First we had to get the point accepted that the precise mathematical average of the size of ship piloted in many instances gave a completely false picture of a pilot's normal task and penalised many in the great industrial ports who happened, in the course of their duties, to pilot large numbers of very small vessels.

Adapting the Union's "mid-way ship of earnings" to a tonnage scale, it soon became easy to produce a midway ship of tonnage which, in most instances, was appreciably larger than the "average" ship. But this Association has always contended that size alone was not the only criterion and other vital factors required to be taken into account. Effect had to be given, we felt, to the aggregate tonnage handled in a port, and point-to-point moves within a large river and similar districts.

Adjustments were accordingly made to the midway ship of tonnage to take account of this aspect also, and in the end it resulted in producing what all agreed was, for the purposes of arriving at pilots' remuneration, to be regarded in each District as the truly "representative" ship. This is what we have called—to adopt the Chamber's expression—"Leg One."

It has produced an agreed order of precedence of ports which can be grouped in tonnage bands in accordance with the N.M.B.

scale, but with a greater number of subdivisions below the maximum in order to give a greater "spread" in pilotage earnings. This order, with the agreed entry point tonnages (*i.e.*, the representative ship for the purpose of entry into the N.M.B. scale) and the actual midway ship for each port are set out as an appendix to this report and for convenience and ease of reference, the ports have been divided by horizontal lines into the groups into which they automatically fall in the expanded N.M.B. scale. It was still found necessary to deviate from the rule in certain instances and possibly one of two further adjustments will have to be made.

There are two further subsidiary but important points to mention. First, it has been agreed that if we can fix an appropriate level of earnings for each District, they should be allowed to fluctuate 10% above or below the mean figure before any adjustment is called for. This clearly involves agreeing a "begin at" figure within the toleration margin as between ports in the same group, according to the degree of their activity at the inception of the scheme. It would be manifestly unreasonable for all in the same group to start automatically at the same mean, irrespective of whether one was working at maximum pressure and the other experiencing an exceptionally quiet period. Unless the busy port starts above and the quiet port below, the proposed toleration could obviously work most unfairly and impose particular hardship on the most active ports. A return to normal trade at both ports would give the quiet one earnings appreciably above and the busy one below the mean for their group. Secondly, both bodies of pilots feel that as between the top and bottom groups the scale of earnings should descend in an even gradation and not, as Mr. O'Leary so graphically put it, "sometimes by two steps, sometimes three and sometimes a whole flight at a time."

So much success having attended our deliberations you may well wonder what is now causing the hold up. We have agreed the representative ship and the "entry point" tonnage for each port into the N.M.B. scale. It should be quite simple, therefore, to turn to the handbook, find the appropriate scale of pay and add to it an agreed percentage to produce a pilot's earnings. It should be, but it is not.

The Sub-Committee at one time began to wonder whether the owners, having won their point in having the Sea Service Scale adopted as the yardstick, do not now like the results it produces. The pilots' representatives have contended that having agreed to apply Merchant Service Scales as a broad guide, and having agreed the size of ship to be used for this purpose at each port, the ascertainment of a pilot's earnings should be to a large extent a matter of pure mathematics. The problem is solved virtually automatically (within certain reasonable tolerances over which there should be little difficulty in

reaching agreement) by the application of the formula so far agreed.

I believe that the problem can now be narrowed down to one outstanding factor namely, the percentage increase to be added to the appropriate published scale. It has never been suggested that there should be a slavish and absolute compliance with the N.M.B. Handbook. It is to be a guide only and, I venture to suggest, serves its purpose by grouping the ports in tonnage bands from 12,000 tons downwards. The earnings of masters (which, of course, differ from line to line) in the various tonnage ranges are reasonably well known and we are ready and able to produce reliable figures for comparison with the levels we are suggesting.

The course of the negotiations once we came to talk of cash (about which you have already heard something) led us into somewhat stonier conditions. Happily, since the most recent meeting at the Ministry, through the good offices of the Chairman, there seems every likelihood of an early resumption, and while I know you will not want me to go there committed beforehand to any particular policy, I am, of course, fully aware that unless agreement can now be reached in the immediate future we shall be obliged, however reluctantly, to seek redress by alternative means. Clearly you are entitled to a decision without further unreasonable delay, and at our meeting both sides must make up their minds whether we have come to the parting of the ways or whether we can carry on together.

It is impossible for me to make any firm assessment of the position, but at the moment we are certainly widely divided, and consideration must therefore be given as to what is to be done in the event of a final breakdown. Let me give you an immediate assurance that that will certainly not be an end of the matter. There is not the slightest intention of casting aside the results of all the patient labour and research and the mass of statistical information accumulated since these discussions began—nor, for that matter, the bond which has welded the two bodies of pilots together in their common struggle.

The task we were set was to seek in direct negotiation with the owners an agreed yardstick or method for fixing the level of earnings at as many ports as possible throughout the country recognising, as we all did, that whatever formula was adopted there was bound to be a certain number of exceptional cases. As the Executive Committee see it, that objective has already been achieved, and both sides have indeed acknowledged as much in a meeting at the Ministry. If, when we come to apply it, we fail to reach agreement then I can suggest no better course than that both sides agree to let the Minister decide. I have no fear of the consequences as far as your interests are concerned.

It cannot be over-emphasised that this Association is asking no more than what the agreed formula produces. The difference

between pilots and shipowners can, in substance, be narrowed down to whether a pilot's remuneration should be in the same region as that of a master of the agreed representative ship or whether it should be substantially less. That is a decision which I venture to suggest you can confidently leave to others, and if we cannot reach agreement with the shipowners I cannot see the slightest justification for either side hesitating to let the Minister arbitrate on that, the only outstanding point. He would decide the mean level of earnings for each group of ports and the starting point within the toleration margin would then depend upon whether trade was above or below normal.

If the shipowners will not accept this suggestion, then in conjunction with the Union pilots, we should proceed independently of them, a course which I greatly hope will never become necessary as it will bring to an end a memorable period of valuable and close co-operation in a common problem and a relationship of mutual confidence which the Association has greatly cherished and would long like to preserve.

I am not unaware that there are certain practical difficulties in asking the Minister to arbitrate at this stage, but these are largely of a precedential nature and should not, in my view, be allowed to obstruct the possibility of real progress.

That, to the best of my ability, is a review of the position as I see it to date, with a word or two about the immediate future, but I feel sure you will not wish me to leave the subject altogether without first recording a word of appreciation of the outstanding services of Mr. Tate, in his constant attention to the difficult and exacting task to which he has devoted and is continuing to devote so much of his time. I frankly do not know where we would be without him. He must have abandoned "for the duration" all hope of normal leisure time and even his brief summer holiday was interrupted for three days with a journey of several hundred miles to attend the most recent meeting at the Ministry. I am sure you will all want him to know how greatly his efforts are appreciated.

Another matter which I am most happy to mention is the cordial relationship which these negotiations have established between your Sub-Committee and the representatives of the Transport and General Workers' Union, with whom we have worked throughout in such close co-operation. The scheme which has emerged is the outcome of an entirely joint effort with an equal contribution by all. During the year Mr. Arthur Bird, whom we all know so well, has faded from the scene to enjoy, we hope for a long time, a well deserved and happy retirement. His place has been filled by Mr. T. T. O'Leary whose grasp of the problem and outstanding ability have quickly earned him the respect of us all. His long, training and experience as a negotiator are proving of great assistance.

I hope, too, you will permit me to name one outstanding Union pilot whose invaluable contribution to the formula should, I venture to think, be for ever associated with his name and to whom I trust I may accordingly refer as Mr. John "Midway" Clement. Nor would it be right to conclude a report of this nature without making most grateful acknowledgement of the immense assistance we have received from the officials of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, and the great courtesy which has invariably been extended to us at our many meetings. The task to which we were committed inevitably involved a great deal of close investigation and research, and many of the figures, including those which enabled us to make the necessary tonnage corrections to arrive at the representative ship, could never have been calculated and most certainly would never have been accepted without the constant help of the Chamber's principal statistician who has worked for so many weeks as a member of one team with Mr. Tate and Mr. Clement.

It would, indeed, be sad if the results achieved as a consequence of so much common effort and line team work were now to be thrown away. I like to believe that such a course is unthinkable. Real progress has been made, and an excellent basis for the settlement of our problem firmly established. Yet final agreement continues to elude our grasp, and, understandably enough, a growing sense of frustration and impatience from so many ports continually being impressed upon your Committee, creates an atmosphere of such urgency that the temptation to give up in face of what we sometimes feel is intransigence on the part of the shipowners becomes almost irresistible. Unless conditions are created which make it quite impossible to continue, I still think we should do everything in our power to stay the course as, after all, in the long run, both shipowners and pilots have a common interest to serve and a common end in view, and I will never believe, given goodwill and equal determination on both sides, that we cannot bridge the present gap.

Most of you will probably be surprised to know—and indeed this Association has learnt it with very great regret—that these negotiations have given rise to a most unfortunate misunderstanding on the part of the Trinity House that the statutory position of Pilotage Authorities as the body responsible for fixing the rates of payment for pilotage services, was in some measure being overlooked. Nothing could be further from the minds of those engaged in them, who have never envisaged any outcome other than the possibility of presenting certain agreed recommendations for consideration and discussion by all other interested parties of whom Pilotage Authorities are, of course, by far the most important. We did feel, however, in view of the absence of anything in the nature of a Central Pilotage Authority or other body representative of all Pilotage Authorities,

that our task would have been rendered completely impossible if every or even all the leading Authorities were to be consulted at this stage. It would be entirely contrary to the long-established policy of this Association to attempt, over this or any other matter concerned with pilotage, to by-pass Authorities, with whom it is desired to work at all times in the closest co-operation.

It is quite true that both shipowners and representatives of the pilots considered that such talks as we both desired should be given unofficial approval by the Ministry, to whom we have reported back from time to time and from whom we have received, by way of a broad general indication, very great assistance on more than one occasion when our views seemed likely to become divergent. The intervention of a third party in whose judgment and impartiality both sides have equal confidence can often ensure a successful outcome to difficult negotiations which otherwise might be doomed to almost inevitable failure. This Association greatly hopes that the Trinity House have long since felt entirely reassured about the position.

Matters of this kind provide yet once more a clear illustration of the pressing need for the creation of a body representative of all Authorities. Fortunately, there are whispers that active consideration is now being given to some such plan and this Association wishes those concerned all success in the speedy establishment of such an organisation. Only when it is brought into existence is there any real likelihood of bringing pilotage law and administration into line with the greatly changed conditions since 1913 and establishing some degree of consistency as between one District and another by, for example, the introduction of something in the nature of a model code of bye-laws for general use, which would go so far towards removing the many entirely arbitrary distinctions which exist to-day, and, in my opinion, are at the root of so many of our troubles and a constant and legitimate source of dissatisfaction to shipowners and pilots alike.

These are matters of possibly long term policy, but an immediate practical problem which has been exercising my mind is how best, not only to place before every Pilotage Authority in the country the proposals which now form the agreed policy of both bodies of pilots and, we hope, before long the shipowners as well, but how they are to be explained so as to be thoroughly understood by such a wide and differing body of people. Pilotage Authorities must be given the fullest opportunity of considering the details and of discussing and understanding the complex figures and data which led to the production of the agreed formula for calculating the representative ship. It is they who, in the first place, would be responsible for submitting to the Minister for confirmation the necessary bye-laws to give effect to the scheme District by District. Naturally they will want to understand the principles involved before

they can be asked to approve and take steps to implement them. How long do you imagine that would take if nearly fifty different Authorities had to be consulted? If an Association of Authorities were formed how greatly would the task be simplified. Indeed, without it, it is difficult to envisage just what are the next steps to take with our level of earnings plan and, at the same time, comply with constitutional procedure laid down in the Pilotage Act.

A matter of considerable importance which I am sure will not have been overlooked by those interesting themselves in the formation of such an Association is that in all but the smallest Districts pilots have a statutory right of representation upon their Authority. When, therefore, the constitution of the Executive Committee is decided upon, no doubt consideration will be given to the number of pilot representatives who are to serve upon it. It might also be of value if the Committee had power to co-opt when desirable to ensure that the service, and indeed advice, of someone who happens to have specialised knowledge and experience might be more readily available in case of need.

You will not, I hope, assume from what I have so far said that routine matters have not had as much of my attention as may be necessary. Although no attempt has been made to "jump the gun" with applications for rate increases in accordance with the new proposals, a fair number of normal adjustments in pilotage dues and charges have taken place during the year (or are at present under active consideration) affecting the following ports: Aberdeen, Ardrossan, Barry, Clyde, Falmouth, Gloucester, Goole, Humber, Ipswich, Isle of Wight, Newhaven, Portsmouth, Preston, South Shields, Tees and Whitehaven.

These changes have brought about or are designed to give in one way and another much needed immediate improvements and no one need feel the slightest concern that by accepting a little "on account" they will prejudice themselves in any eventual settlement on a national basis which may take place.

The Minister's decision in the Dover Harbour case has been dealt with so recently that I have no intention of making further reference to it here save to emphasise two points.

First, it is frequently suggested that to display a willingness to compromise is a sign of weakness, and that immediate advantage would be taken at the first sign of doing so. In this case, about which you may remember at one time the Cinque Ports pilots felt exceedingly strongly, the initial compromise proposals came from the pilots and went a very long way, at the cost of considerable change in existing arrangements, to meet the requirements of the Harbour Board. In later discussions these concessions went appreciable further, but for reasons which I need not go into, were still found unacceptable. During the final meeting at the Ministry yet one more variation was considered and the pilots were

allowed to withdraw in order to discuss it. That compromise was found unacceptable and accordingly rejected. In spite of everything, the Minister's final decision was completely in the pilots' favour. Nothing was lost—indeed, everything was gained—by displaying an obvious desire to go as far as possible to meet the other side.

Secondly, if I may be allowed to express a hope and a personal view, I would like to see the Harbour Board, who feel dissatisfied with the Minister's decision, enter into direct and unofficial talks with the pilots whom I am confident are anxious, as indeed all pilots should be, to serve to the best of their ability all those who are in any way affected by the way in which the service is run. While this Association was wholeheartedly behind the pilots in their opposition to the removal of Dover Harbour from their licences, it is equally concerned that the reasonable requirements of those who use or depend upon the service are met to the maximum possible extent. We are vitally interested in the popularity of Dover Harbour and should do everything to assist the Harbour Board in maintaining and improving its reputation, and to co-operate with them in all measures to that end.

It is, presumably, only to be expected that in a report intended to give a broad review of the many activities of your Association during the year gone by a certain number of "hardy annuals" should crop up. Difficulties have again risen at more than one port regarding exactly what ships are to be included among those exempt by statute from the obligation to take a pilot in a compulsory district upon the ground that they belong to Her Majesty. How far was it the intention of the legislature to extend this freedom beyond commissioned ships of the Royal Navy under the command of officers on the active list? The wide extension of public ownership and certain changes in established practice as to the ownership of naval vessels undergoing acceptance trials have made it desirable that the present uncertainties should be removed.

Like any other problem for solution, the first essential requirement is to know the facts. A difficulty frequently arises in relation to vessels undergoing trials prior to handing over to the Admiralty, or with former naval vessels being similarly tested before being transferred to foreign Governments. In all such cases the governing consideration seems to be whether at the time they were in fact the property of the Admiralty and, as to this, I am greatly indebted to the Principal of the Pilotage Department of the Trinity House for the following extract from a letter from their Lordships in 1953, when the test then sought to be applied was the flag which the ship was flying.

"It is not incorrect for the ship to fly the Red Ensign as her national colours until such time as she is finally accepted and commissioned as one of Her Majesty's Ships and flies the White Ensign. It must be held

that the flag she flies during her trials cannot be said to determine her ownership or to invalidate her right to exemption from compulsory pilotage as an Admiralty-owned ship under the provisions of Section 11 (3) (a) of the Pilotage Act, 1913, which applies to "Ships belonging to Her Majesty."

This is an important problem which I think might well be taken up again in co-operation with the Trinity House, both with the Admiralty and with the Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation. It is, in some measure, a question perhaps not so much of sticking strictly to the letter of the law, as coming to a satisfactory working arrangement. Pilots rightly resent ships navigating in compulsory waters, which are not entitled to wear the White Ensign, engaging the services of an apparently unlicensed pilot to conduct their trials, even if technically their claim for exemption might be justified.

Turning to the other side of the picture, foreign warships are certainly not exempt, but no pilot attempts to force his services upon such vessels when in full commission and wearing their national flag. It has been said by the pilots concerned that they would consider it improper to press their services upon these ships when making courtesy calls and they have every desire to respect the international character of such visits. This attitude, I think, calls for reciprocation on the part of the Admiralty and I hope a suitable give and take plan can soon be agreed upon.

DEBATE ON THE REPORT

The adoption of the report was moved by Mr. Richman and Mr. Page seconded.

After thanking Mr. Griffiths for the early distribution of copies of the report, Mr. PAGE said the report showed up the fact that in pilotage nothing of a major character could be done in less than a year or two. They came up against it every time and the results were not coming along. One rather troublesome point was the hint that Pilotage Authorities felt aggrieved. It seemed to him that the policy from the moment when negotiations were started had been to leave out the Authorities. Most of the Authorities had shipowners or their associates as members and it was really surprising that the Authorities had not been in the negotiations from the start. The most important thing the Authorities had to do before they got down to actual figures on earnings was to reach agreement on what was a fair number of acts of pilotage per man per annum. There were cases round the kingdom where men were doing double the work they should, and he knew pilots who were doing 100 hours a week on duty. Dr. Page said he felt very strongly that this was the major stone to be laid before they could fill in what the earnings should be. He commented upon the absence from the report

Instances have occurred of fishery protection vessels and the like not directly or indirectly under the jurisdiction of the Admiralty purporting to claim exemption, and I can only advise those of you to whom this problem is at all common to take the question up with your Authority immediately it arises, and in the event of any difference of view to refer it to me in order that the claim, can be investigated in detail.

Before I conclude my report, I know you would wish me to make at any rate a brief reference to the retirement of Mr. Webb from the post of Honorary Treasurer and the resignation of Mr. H. B. Eagle from the Executive Committee. When one looks back, as I have done, through the pages of *The Pilot* for a generation or more, these two names are so intimately connected with the work of this Association that their departure from our midst and the loss of their wise guidance and experience must inevitably leave an irreplaceable gap, as all such occasions do. Their places will be taken by others, but can never be entirely filled. Two outstanding personalities, who have done so much to enhance the cause of this Association and the great profession which now has the honour to acclaim them, will pass from active participation in our affairs. May they enjoy many years of happy retirement, sheltered from the squalls of pilotage. We wish them all good fortune and hope that they will not forget us as we carry on—we shall certainly not forget them.

of any reference to some of the resolutions passed at the last Conference—the pension scheme for instance. The Finance Act of 1956 made a big concession to pilots in accepting them as self-employed, and it was possible to get full rebate on Income Tax in respect of a pension scheme. He thought there might be a possibility of some commercial house putting up a scheme which would be attractive to a pilot under 45 who considered he was not going to get enough pension.

MR. RHODES also referred to the omission from the report of any reference to the resolutions passed at the 1955 Conference.

The Chairman referred them to *The Pilot* for August, 1956, pages 7 and 8, giving the decisions of the Executive Committee on the Conference resolutions.

The Secretary explained that the first thing he considered when preparing his annual report was what progress they had in fact made during the year. With regard to E.T.A. he obtained from the Chamber of Shipping an expression of their willingness to co-operate as far as they reasonable could in getting their members to agree to implement the wishes of the Association, but they pointed

out that any expense to be added to the burden now borne by coastwise shipping would only harden the position on increased pilotage earnings. The Executive felt that they did not want to press the point at this juncture at the expenses of other more important matters. With regard to extra services scarcely any two districts dealt with the problem in the same way, and when he wanted a definition of what was included he found it very difficult to get one agreed. However, the matter was by no means forgotten but only put aside to be dealt with at a more suitable opportunity.

MR. JAMES asked to be associated with Mr. Page in complimenting Mr. Griffiths on his very comprehensive survey. Even if the results had not been what some people had looked for they knew what had been done. He also congratulated Mr. Griffiths and the Executive on the way they had handled the Dover Harbour question. It was a fine thing to have upheld the right of the pilots not to have their licences tampered with.

These remarks gave MR. GARNER a suitable opportunity for voicing the thanks of the Cinque ports pilots to Mr. Griffiths for his untiring efforts on their behalf.

MR. ROBERTS asked how the Cinque pilots could make the Dover Harbour Board more co-operative.

The Secretary said that following the decision of the Dover Harbour Board wrote a letter of protest saying that they were still dissatisfied with the pilotage arrangements. He was quite certain that the correct attitude for the pilots was to assist to the maximum. From his talks with Mr. Garner and his colleagues he had come to the conclusion that if the Board established a more intimate and personal relationship with the Cinque ports pilots many of the difficulties could be overcome.

"We have succeeded in safeguarding a vital principle" Mr. Griffiths added "and we could sit back and do nothing more but we know the Board are dissatisfied. They may think it worthwhile to approach the pilots in an informal way for further discussions on a friendly basis. If there are difficulties perhaps they could best be overcome in that way. The solution is for the Board to go to the pilots with practical working suggestions. No doubt any satisfactory agreement would receive the approval of Trinity House."

MR. CONWAY considered the earnings scheme the greatest thing the U.K.P.A. had seen in the past 10 years. The obvious sincerity in its compilation should not be jettisoned, but they had not been met by the same sincerity from the opposition who could employ all manner of spanners to throw into the works. Pilotage Authorities were composed in the main of men whose interests the pilots served.

"The Executive Committee" continued Mr. Conway, "should take into consideration what will happen if this thing is kicked about

much longer. How far are the pilots prepared to go? Only the threat of something drastic will make the shipowners more amenable. I don't say strike, but withdrawal of service."

"What is meant by alternative means?" MR. DALTON asked the Secretary. "Are you going to advise us to withdraw labour?"

"I don't recommend anything of the kind" Mr. GRIFFITHS replied. "If you can't do anything by agreement with the opposition, the two pilot bodies must present an application through the proper channels to get their case before the Minister."

MR. BERRY said that Pilotage Authorities did not and would not shoulder their responsibility.

THE CHAIRMAN cited the Manchester pilots' application as an illustration of the quick and serious repercussions isolated action could cause. When Manchester in their wisdom sought a public inquiry they did not consult the other pilots on how they should go ahead.

MR. SLADE thought the pilots should have sought the support of the Pilotage Authorities. With that, and having agreed on the representative ship they would not have so much to overcome.

MR. TAYLOR gently suggested that Mr. Slade must have a very fine Authority and this was agreed!

THE CHAIRMAN reminded Conference that the exclusion of Pilotage Authorities was entirely due to the fact that there was no central organisation to represent them.

"If the pilots and the shipowners can get together and agree, we could force the Authorities to agree—they don't pay the money" declared MR. SPENCER.

THE CHAIRMAN: "So many of the Authorities are shipowners, but for good or ill the course has been adopted to go ahead without them at their stage."

MR. INNES regarded Manchester as a test case. The pilots there were driven to demand a formal inquiry because they were determined not to continue under the existing conditions.

MR. GRAINGER supported the policy of going ahead without the Pilotage Authorities. If the Authorities had taken more interest in the welfare of the pilots, he said, they would not have found themselves in the position of seeing the pilots negotiating directly with the shipowners. He added that they might have to wait three years before an Association of Pilotage Authorities could be formed.

MR. TAYLOR, who earlier had said that when port grouping was first mooted, he felt there was fresh air in their affairs for the first time in 20 or 30 years, said that the Clyde held back their application right to the last so as not to prejudice negotiations.

The report was then adopted unanimously.

BALANCE SHEET

MR. WEBB moved the adoption of the Statement of Accounts (in the Statement published in *The Pilot* of August the year to which it referred was given as 1956; it should, of course, have been 1955). It showed a surplus of £113 on the year, and investments and assets at roughly £5,800.

"You have had pretty heavy expenses" said Mr. Webb, "but I have great pleasure in telling you that owing to the increased subscriptions and the 60 new members who came in during the first half of the year, you will not have to draw much from the reserve." With regard to subscriptions, Mr. Webb said one port had paid only to the end of March and, being six months in arrears, could have no claim on the Association according to the rules. One port had paid to the end of May, 13 to the end of June, three to the end of July and ten to the end of September. Seven of the smallest ports in the Kingdom had paid the full subscription to the end of the year. "None of your money is being wasted," Mr. Webb declared, and he advised Conference to build up a reserve a good deal higher than it was to-day.

MR. PAGE who commented that they were in a much healthier position proposed the adoption of the accounts.

This was seconded by MR. HOLLAND and carried.

Conference then adjourned for lunch.

RESOLUTIONS

Food for the Pilot

When Conference met on the morning of September 27, MR. RICHMAN moved the following resolution of which Goole had given notice:

That this Conference resolves that in future all pilot notes should include a paragraph which states: "The pilot shall be provided with a meal at the recognised meal times and if such a meal is not provided an appropriate charge will be made."

He said that after the discussion on earnings this was by way of a damp squib. No doubt many delegates thought it was of no importance at all, but in coastal work where there was a long pilotage the pilot was left alone on the bridge of some British coasters while one after another of the crew went below for a meal. The pilot might be left six, seven or more hours without being offered food, but there was no doubt the master claimed for feeding the pilot. Goole had a bye-law which said, the pilot should be fed, but if they took every case where he was not to the Authority, there would be no other work done because it happened more often than not. He urged that they should try to get something on a national basis on the same lines as the Dutch and Belgian pilot notes. It might quicken the conscience of the master.

MR. ROBERTS who seconded, said that it should be applicable only to those ports who required it, and MR. INNES thought it would be easier if the provision were incorporated in the bye-law instead of on the note.

MR. RICHMAN repeated that they had the bye-law.

MR. CONWAY pointed out that there might be some difficulty in what constituted a meal.

THE SECRETARY said that in his opinion there would be no power to enforce a payment against an owner who was unable or did not provide a meal, unless the bye-laws approved by the Minister covered the point. Also, unless the bye-laws covered that point, there would be no legal authority for including such a charge on the pilot note. That did not mean, however, that this resolution could not be discussed and voted upon, because it would have considerable effect on those shipowners who at present did not provide meals.

MR. GARNER: Do I understand from Mr. Griffiths that the shipowner is not legally compelled to provide a meal while I am on board?

MR. GRIFFITHS: That is so.

MR. GARNER: Then it is time we did something about it. We are faced with it every day we do piloting, and it is ludicrous that we should be dependent on charity. The sooner it becomes something that is our right the better; I am extremely annoyed about the whole business.

MR. SPENCER said that they were blaming the wrong man. The owner paid. It was the master or the steward who was responsible. Only once in a foreign going ship had it been necessary for him to go to the master about it.

MR. RHODES contended that meals should be provided without the pilot having to make the request.

Then the point arose as to what was the recognised meal time and some of the varying practices on board foreign ships were mentioned.

MR. BERRY quoted a case which was taken up by the owners and the master was brought to heel. If a pilot did not receive a meal, he said, it was much better to take it up direct with the owner of the ship.

MR. TAYLOR mentioned that they had a bye-law providing for a payment of 5s. in lieu of a meal.

MR. HOLLAND, speaking from 27 years' experience, could not recall a case where he had not been given a meal.

MR. GREENWOOD said Dutch coasters were his bete noir. They varied: some pieces of bread had cheese, other spotted dog. He did not blame the master because they had not the staff aboard.

MR. JAMES said they were in favour of the principle, but they could not agree with the resolution as it stood. If it were not legal it was no good putting it on the pilot note.

continued on p. 14

There were frequent references at the Conference to the schedule, the form of which is shown below. It is regretted that no details can be given for Columns 6, 7, 8 and 9, as the figures which were submitted on both sides were regarded as confidential and cannot therefore be disclosed.

1 PORT	2 Expanded N.M.B. tonnage groups	3 Agreed entry point ton- nages (gross)	4 Actual mid- way ship for each port (gross)	5 Average mid- way ship in N.M.B. groups (gross)	6 Comparative Master's earn- ings (excluding bonus, special payments, etc.) of Column 5 ship	7 Pilots' Proposals			8 Starting % above or below mean for each port	9 Proposed "begin at" figure
						-10%	Mean	×10%		
I.O.W. (Out)	12001 & over	27515	17293	11496						
I.O.W. (In)		25137	16863							
London		18700	6842							
Clyde		14665	8834							
Liverpool		13435	7648							
Manchester	11001-12000	11698	7482	7482						
Tyne	9001-10000	9970	6690	6690						
Bristol	8001-9000	8918	7488	7745						
Falmouth *		8716	9430							
Swansea		8570	7428							
Tees		8117	6635							
Newport	7001-8000	7322	6730	6730						
Barrow	6001-7000	6660	9505	7642						
Hull		6537	5780							
Cardiff	5001-6000	5808	3928	3413						
Sunderland		5543	2887							
Barry		5098	2423							
Leith	4001-5000	4520	2902	3875						
Grangemouth		4510	6237							
Blyth		4213	1922							
Belfast		4177	5343							
Port Talbot		4023	2970							
Whitehaven	3001-4000	3802	2782	5379						
Milford *		3624	7023							
Plymouth *		3523	9520							
Hartlepool		3507	2208							
Burntisland *		3277	6063							
Preston		3108	3273							
Dundee		3073	6790							
Methill	2001-3000	2733	1653	1779						
Ardrossan		2682								
Ipswich		2618	2623							
B'ness		2328	1285							
Fowey		2298	1558							
Poole	1001-1500	1335	1185	1117						
Goole		1285	1222							
Aberdeen		1262	928							
Shoreham		1245	1063							
Londonderry		1200	980							
Portsmouth		1193	1077							
Cowes		1143								
Gloucester		1085	1362							
Newhaven	751-1000	970	1142	985						
Trent		903	792							
Dee		855	1023							
King's Lynn	501-750	762		471						
Yarmouth		742	560							
St. Ives		585	395							
Boston		562	573							
Lowestoft		525	453							
Taw and Torridge		523	423							
Teignmouth		523	425							
Colchester	301-400	383	448	374						
Peterhead		367	463							
Exeter		338	232							
Amble		327	502							
Bridgwater		325	228							
Wisbech	201-300	270	186	253						
Inverness		12	440							
Coleraine		193	132							

After further discussion the resolution was amended by eliminating the word "all" and finishing at the words "recognised meal times." It then read:

That this Conference resolves that in future pilot notes should include a paragraph which states "The pilot shall be provided with a meal at the recognised meal time."

In this form it was passed with four dissentients.

MR. RICHMAN said he was very pleased with the result; it was rather more than he expected to get. At Goole practically every trip they had was a bad "feeder," but the pilot's meal always went on the portage bill. It was not the shipowner they were after; the real aim of the resolution was to get something which would prod the master's conscience in such a way that he would think about the pilot when meal time came along.

A resolution which was not on the agenda was admitted by the Executive for discussion. It came from Gravesend Channel and was as follows:

That this Association shall take immediate steps to secure that where a pilot's licence is revoked or suspended and the pilot appeals under section 28 of the Pilotage Act he shall, on lodging his appeal, be granted a temporary licence similar to his own and effective until the appeal verdict is given.

MR. GLASSBOROW, proposing, said that it arose from two recent cases in which the pilots were suspended. The London Pilotage Committee consisted of four Elder Brethren, two shipowners and two pilots. If a pilot came before the Committee the first thing he did on entering the room was to place his licence on the table. If the committee decided to suspend the licence the pilot lost it then and there. If the pilot decided to appeal, the hearing might not take place for several weeks during which he could earn no money as a pilot. If the appeal were successful he still lost the money because on the London station he could not make up more than one or two back turns and that was why they were asking for the arrangement proposed in the resolution. It was the only way they could see out of it. If the pilot lost his appeal the temporary licence would run out and he could then begin his suspension.

MR. PAGE, seconding, said that if under the present method of dealing with licences a pilot served his suspension and was vindicated at the appeal he should have a right to compensation in law. It would come from the Pilot Fund which was the pilots' own money. The legal costs of the Authority, even if the pilot won, would also come from that fund which, of course, would be to the disadvantage of the Benefit Fund.

At the request of Mr. Berry, MR. GRIFFITHS explained the position. He said that in any appeal there were always two aspects to be considered. It might be an appeal against the conviction itself which was an appeal

against the whole decision, or it might be against the sentence only. A pilot might say: "I was in the wrong, was found guilty and have been rightly convicted, but the sentence is harsh and unreasonable, and I desire only to have it modified." It was the practice in the criminal courts of superior jurisdiction, where there was an appeal against a sentence of imprisonment, for the accused to remain in prison until the appeal was disposed of. What was even more curious was that that period of waiting, subject to a certain maximum, did not even count as part of the sentence. About 90 per cent of criminal cases were, however, dealt with summarily. Where an accused person was sentenced by magistrates the court had power to allow the appellant bail pending his appeal. Mr. Griffiths said he was in complete sympathy with the object of the resolution. A pilot not infrequently appeared before his Authority in respect of an offence alleged to have been committed many months before and meanwhile, of course, had been carrying on his normal duties. He saw nothing unreasonable in an Authority immediately on receipt of a notice of appeal holding in abeyance their verdict until the appeal was disposed of. If the court upheld the appeal no injustice resulted. If the appeal were dismissed the sentence originally imposed could then operate. In very few cases indeed could one imagine that any harm would be done by adopting the procedure suggested in the resolution, but one should not be too ready to generalise as there were always exceptional cases to be provided for. One could imagine some form of gross misconduct which rendered a pilot wholly unfitted for the responsibilities his licence entitled him to discharge, and an Authority summarily revoking it after proper inquiry. Suppose he insisted upon appealing nobody could stop him, but in the meantime surely he should not be allowed to exercise his licence. An Authority should have full discretion as to whether to suspend their sentence until the appeal had been disposed of and ordinarily speaking one would expect them to do so.

MR. ROBERTS suggested that if an Authority saw fit to suspend surely their discretion was again going to be applied when they came to consider the issue of a temporary licence.

MR. GARNER said that in a court of law one obtained justice, but they did not always get it from a Pilotage Authority—the master mariners did not like their judgment questioned. They heard the case and then said what they thought should have been done. Mr. Garner recalled some passages written by Sir John Inskip in his last report to Conference.

Sir John said: "too often the Pilotage Authority calls a pilot before it to answer a charge of 'failure in or neglect of his duty as a pilot,' which are the words of the Pilotage Act. No evidence is called from the other side, and after a statement by some officer of the Authority, the pilot is

expected to make his reply and to answer any questions put to him.

"I have always advised pilots to be very jealous of their rights in this respect, and whilst they must, of course, answer the summons to appear before the Pilotage Authority, they should refuse to make any statement or to answer any question until it is stated how he is alleged to have failed in or neglected his duty."

MR. GARNER added: "that their Authority had not yet done this, and frequently the pilot's legal representative had asked 'what has this pilot failed to do?' but the answer was not forthcoming."

MR. BEWLEY asked if any Pilotage Authority was entitled to grant temporary licences without examination.

MR. GRIFFITHS replied that no such power was given. Under a wartime measure there was such a provision, but it did not occur in the Pilotage Act.

MR. CONWAY said that Mr. Page had spoken about the money coming from the Pilot Fund, but he thought the Authority should be prepared to back their contention with their own money. The remark brought a loud "hear, hear" and the shout of "they haven't any."

MR. GIBSON said they employed a solicitor to give them a legal point of view which Mr. Griffiths had done and he moved "progress."

MR. GLASBOROW said that if Mr. Griffiths advised them to leave the resolution a little more open they would re-frame it accordingly.

Amended as follows it was carried unanimously:

That this Association take immediate steps to secure that where a pilot's licence is revoked or suspended and the pilot appeals under Section 28 of the Pilotage Act the decision of the Authority shall remain in abeyance until the appeal is disposed of.

ELECTIONS

Conference then proceeded to the election of officers. Mr. Tate temporarily vacated the chair and Mr. Webb presided "for the last time"—his own words. The business was quickly disposed of.

The delegates were immediately of one mind when Mr. Fife proposed the re-election of SIR PETER MACDONALD, the seconder being Mr. Page.

MESSRS. TATE and WYNN were re-elected vice-presidents with alacrity, and Mr. Tate thanked Conference for the "doubtful privilege." Mr. Wynn also replied and said he had a fairly easy job.

There was a unanimous vote for the re-election of MR. GRIFFITHS as Secretary. The proposer was Mr. Berry and the seconder Mr. Richman.

Mr. Webb who resigned from the honorary treasurership said he felt that the office was like the fifth wheel of the coach. All it called

for was that a member of the Executive Committee should be authorised to sign cheques, and he suggested that MR. WYNN should be the man. Such an arrangement would save the Association money.

MR. JACKSON adopted the suggestion as a proposal; it was seconded by Mr. Hall and carried unanimously.

MR. WYNN in reply said the treasurer always seemed to enjoy a long life.

The Auditor, MR. J. B. WATLING, F.C.A. (Messrs. Watling and Partners, Bristol) was re-elected on the proposition of Mr. Spencer; seconded by Mr. Holland.

Conference accorded the Editor of *The Pilot* a vote of thanks and Mr. Curthoys replied.

There were four vacancies on the Executive Committee. One was caused by the resignation of Mr. H. B. Eagle. Messrs. J. H. Innes, J. P. Bennett and L. R. Slade retired in accordance with rule 11, and being eligible without nomination consented to stand for re-election. In addition, Messrs. S. Hall, F. V. Janes, R. B. Page and H. Richman had been nominated.

Before the vote was taken Mr. Tate who had returned to the chair on his re-election, pointed out that delegates could vote for one, two, three or four names, but it was desirable that they should vote for the maximum number.

The ballot resulted as follows:—

MR. J. H. INNES, Clyde	52
MR. L. R. SLADE, Cardiff	48
MR. F. V. JANES, Southampton	39
MR. R. B. PAGE, Gravesend	34
MR. J. P. BENNETT, Barry	33
MR. H. RICHMAN, Goole	16
MR. S. HALL, Sunderland	12

The first four were declared elected and briefly replied.

MR. JANES raised a cheer when he said:

"We have always been 100% U.K.P.A. and always will be."

NEXT CONFERENCE

It was agreed to hold the Conference in London next year on dates to be decided by the Executive.

One delegate suggested that the Conference should occupy three days.

HAPPY RETIREMENT

The Chairman said that all pilots and all seamen would like to join him in wishing MR. WEBB and MR. EAGLE long life and health in happy retirement.

Thanking the delegates, MR. WEBB said he did not know whether retirement was a matter for joy or regret.

MR. EAGLE said he stopped on the following Sunday night after 39 years' service. "I hope I shall not lose touch with you," he added. "You have a wonderful Association and if you can get help from anybody—do so. I have been very bitter against the Union, but my views have altered."

CONFERENCE DISCUSSES THE FORMULA

THE whole of the second session of the Conference—the afternoon of September 26—was given up to a discussion of item 4 on the agenda—"Pilots' earnings—the new formula and the next step." The delegates had before them the schedule shown on pages 12-13. The columns included one for the "comparative master's earnings," and pilots' proposals had been left blank but the figures were read out during the session, also the amounts the Chamber of Shipping were prepared to discuss for each group of ports from 2001 tons upwards.

At the beginning the Secretary gave a broad outline of the negotiations, the difficulties of the situation and the position which had been reached. Up to a certain point, he said, there had been a most cordial spirit with pilots and officials of the Chamber working in the closest harmony as one team. Then it all came to an end. Agreement had been reached between them as to the order of precedence of ports grouped together in tonnage bands following the N.M.B. scale, but in steps down of 1,000 tons as far as the 2/3,000 ton band and thereafter in smaller steps. They had been able to agree the "midway" or representative ship for each port in every group, and the average size ship for each group was therefore a matter of pure arithmetic. Having thus arrived at a representative ship, the next step was to obtain particulars as to the master's earnings for such vessels in order to compare that figure with the pilots' proposals. As a result of the very great co-operation which he received from the local secretaries of the U.K.P.A., Mr. Tate obtained that information and they wished to thank the secretaries for their help. The Chamber, however, said the figures were all moonshine; the masters did not get anything like it. They also said that they had never agreed that the pilots' earnings were to be roughly on a par with those of the master. Having agreed the representative ship of the ports, the pilots' sub-committee had suggested putting a reasonable figure opposite the top port and then coming down the scale in even stages from group to group but it rather looked as if the owners did not now like the results which the agreed formula were producing. One thing which had clearly emerged was that in the light of the formula and the information on earnings at sea, the pilots' figures were absolutely reasonable.

Mr. RICHMAN said that without detracting from their appreciation of the amount of work put in by the Chairman, they felt that the time had come to review the situation. This scheme was introduced two years ago and it was to be a fair and equitable method of assessing pilots' earnings. Unfortunately, it did not and never had included as a factor the amount of work a pilot did for the money he received. This must be to the disadvantage of a port like Goole where they did a great number of small vessels. When the scheme was discussed at the last Conference

Goole did not vote for or against it so as to give it another year. It has gone as they said it would; the shipowners had concentrated on the upper group and those lower down had to fall into line. In the case of Goole the figure was lower than it was now. What would happen later on? No doubt they would be told that ports like Goole would have special consideration.

"Who is going to fight for them?" Mr. Richman asked. "Even the undoubted brilliance of our Secretary is not going to get us far! Goole has been on a parity with some ports which are very much at the top of the grouping scheme. We feel we are in great danger of going to the wall by it. It is all very well having a scheme, but not just for the sake of having one. There are many ports which perhaps through apathy or lack of time to get here, cannot put to us their feelings about it. The feeling is very strong and you cannot move them. A scheme which was a good one has been amended and messed about. It only perpetuates the old anomalies and does not take into account the hours of work and conditions. I move that this Conference informs the Chamber and the Union that it wishes to have no further negotiations on the subject."

There was no seconder and immediately Mr. BEWLEY pointed out that Great Yarmouth would suffer a decrease under the scheme.

Mr. DALTON said exactly the same would happen at Shoreham and out of the suggested limit they had to maintain their boats.

(The latter part of the remark was greeted with cries of "No.")

Continuing his remarks Mr. Dalton asked why Shoreham should suffer while Sunderland had an increase and added "We, in Shoreham cannot support this scheme."

THE CHAIRMAN: We have an assurance from the shipowners who are accepting this scheme that there will be no reduction.

Mr. DALTON: Pilotage is work we do. If we do a lot of work we want the money; we don't want to do the same amount of work for less money.

Mr. TAYLOR foresaw that if they came to an agreement the time was not far distant when

the Ministry would come along and nationalise pilotage whether they liked it or not. It seemed that they were back almost at the position of "somewhere between master and mate." He also criticised the linking of pilots with the merchant service and said pilots' earnings had never been linked with anything.

The Chairman pointed out that the only reason why the linking with the N.M.B. scale was agreed to was the security value. They had naturally asked for direct representation on the board.

Mr. GLASSBOROW said they would have liked to see the number of ships a pilot was expected to work to get these rates.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is our proposal to establish first what a pilot is worth and then to tackle the matter from the work angle.

Mr. HUTCHINGS: I ask you to remove the name of Southampton from the list and not to arbitrate on our behalf.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why do you wish it? You are the highest paid port. The shipowners offered the same for both Inward and Outward. We asked if it would be possible for this to be adjusted in the two Districts and they said "No; not if it results in one District getting more than the maximum level fixed for the highest paid port."

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Closely allied with the policy of dissent is the obvious possibility that Southampton might resign from the Association. I would regard such a step coming from one of the most respected body of pilots in the country as nothing short of a calamity. It would do the Association whose motto is "United we stand" very great harm. Are we to be told that as long as this Association acting through its Executive is prepared to keep the Inward pilots down £200 or £300 a year lower than the shipowners are willing to pay, then their colleagues in the Outward service will have no further objection to this scheme? We have come to a grave and disastrous situation in the Association if this is to commend itself to the pilots of the United Kingdom. (Prolonged applause).

Mr. GARNER did not think they had had a full statement of the problem and Mr. Jones said that it was not quite a fair picture; there was no thought of resigning.

Mr. PAGE asked why the Isle of Wight could not be regarded as one port with the junior pilots working inward and the senior men outward. All they wanted was to be regarded as one body of pilots. If the shipowners accepted that for the Clyde they could not refuse it to the Isle of Wight where the position was identical.

Mr. TAYLOR suggested that the solution was for the Inward and Outward men to be grouped as one port and leave it to them to arrange that the Outward pilots had more than the Inward.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chamber of Shipping would not have it if they had any knowledge of the arrangement.

Mr. EAGLE suggested that the Inward delegates should give their version.

Mr. RADFORD said they supported the Association and were quite satisfied.

Mr. MORGAN said the matter was more serious than a domestic quarrel.

The argument continued for some time. One delegate said that he wondered whether he had wandered into a women's meeting. It had got round, he said, that the scheme was falling to pieces because there were differences in Southampton, and he appealed to the Southampton pilots to consider their action most seriously, adding "The shipowners have taken hold of it and they are going to use it as a weapon."

Mr. GARNER said he was not quite clear about what Shoreham and Goole wanted. Did they want to die the richest men in the graveyard? The number of acts of pilotage must be agreed with the Authority if and when this national level of earnings was implemented.

A Shoreham delegate said: "We are quite happy and only want to be left alone, but we want something for other people."

"He is anxious for the London pilots to get as much as Shoreham" commented the Chairman.

Mr. Richman and Mr. Higgins continued the discussion and then Mr. Marshall broke in with the remark that he had not heard one grievance against the scheme but only domestic matters. He asked for a little sympathy for Mr. Tate, Mr. Clement and Mr. Griffiths who could have gone forward but they would not let the little fellows take just what fell from the big boys' table.

Mr. GRIFFITHS said he was looking forward to visiting Shoreham which was not a large port. They were determined that the shipowner should not take advantage of the lesser ports.

Another point made by Mr. Griffiths was that in the case of a port where the work has fallen off and rates were increased to bring the pilots up to a reasonable level, the shipowners were entitled to some adjustment, if and when trade returned to the normal level.

Mr. DALTON said that a point which had been overlooked was that the shipowners were paying them more only because of the extra work they were getting, but while the shipowners were getting twice as much money the pilots were not.

After Mr. Grainger and Mr. Richman had spoken the discussion ended and Conference adjourned for the day.

JOINT MEETING OF PILOTS

U.K.P.A. and Union pilots sat together at the meeting in the Court Room of the Wellington on the afternoon of September 27, 1956. Those who had attended the U.K.P.A. Conference were there in full force and were joined by Mr. T. O'Leary and the following pilot members of the Union :—

SWANSEA	W. L. Bevan, J. F. Clement, H. Munn, P. Reid.
NEWPORT.....	T. England, W. Friend, A. W. Venn.
BARRY	C. J. M. Bennett.
MANCHESTER	R. T. Green, Jas. Lee.
DUNDEE	R. P. Saunderson.
LIVERPOOL	D. R. Herbert, D. Bingham.
BLYTE	A. Barron.
SEAHAM	R. Hudson.
TYNE	J. Purvis.
BRISTOL	R. W. Withers.

Mr. TATE welcomed the Union men to what was "more than a meeting—it was an occasion." To show their friends how far the Association had got he read the resolution passed at Conference regarding the calling of a general meeting if a satisfactory solution was not reached by January 1, 1957, and then called on Mr. O'Leary to address them.

Mr. O'LEARY followed up Mr. Tate's remark and said it was more than an occasion—it was an event when the whole of the living body of pilots could unite for a common cause.

"It is difficult," he said, "when two bodies are catering for the same interests. The more alike you are the more suspicious you may be that the other fellow is making an excursion into your territory. That has been the situation in the past. In the brief period since I relieved Mr. Bird I have worked, if not obviously, at any rate carefully for unity among pilots. It is pretty obvious to me that our friends the employers have regarded you not as a united body but as rivals that could be played one against the other. It would be unfortunate, if true, for it would be a weakness other people would not hesitate to exploit. If you recognise the value of standing together you are half way there. If you have a common policy it does not mean that you start throwing your weight about like a lot of irresponsible people. The more united you are and the stronger you become the more responsible you have to be. With privileges or rights must go responsibility. Nobody has ever said that the pilots have been irresponsible or unmindful of their duty. What could be said is that they have too often been unmindful of their rights. That is a very unusual state of affairs. You are a responsible body representing a bigger and more responsible body throughout the country. You are familiar with the history of the negotiations up to date. It has been an awful long time and we have not got very far, perhaps because in the past we have not presented a united front. From now on, we will go forward as one in spirit and policy if not in body."

Mr. TATE said the U.K.P.A. men had talked themselves dizzy in the past couple of days and would like to hear Union opinion.

Mr. CLEMENT said they had not brought a clear cut resolution but they were unanimous in feeling that if before a certain date something was not done they should do exactly what the Association resolution said—call a meeting of pilots. In addition, they were all extremely anxious that the two Associations be welded into one and not speak with two voices.

Mr. TATE explained that it seemed to be the desire of Conference to fix a time limit for negotiations which had been going on seven years, surely reasonable time enough to give anyone. Various dates had been suggested, and January 1st at last produced the desired effect. They would like to know what the Union men thought of that date.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: For the first time, pilots of the Union and this Association, so far as I am aware, are meeting together with a common aim, and what is happily more important, with a common method of achieving it. The real object, which we hope may be the result of this meeting, is that we should as a united body of pilots pass a forthright resolution calculated not to cause offence to anyone but to indicate to all concerned, and primarily the shipowners, that we are completely united in our ideas and the methods by which we are to achieve the level of earnings we believe to be reasonable and fair, and that we do not propose to go on talking without ever obtaining definite results. A resolution summing up the united determination of every licensed pilot throughout the kingdom is likely to produce results with the shipowners and others concerned which will bring an end to these protracted negotiations. Either we shall arrive at satisfactory figures or we shall know that they disagree and then it will be for Mr. O'Leary and me to advise our respective Executives what the next step ought to be. If we are to reach disagreement let us do so quickly so that we know where we are. Our

object will be to reach agreement and settle this problem to everyone's satisfaction within the next couple of meetings with the shipowners' representatives.

Mr. CLEMENT asked what was meant by "holding a meeting."

Mr. TATE said he understood that it would not be a delegate meeting but one attended by all licensed pilots.

Mr. TAYLOR, the mover of the resolution, said that was the intention. The inevitable result was that there would be no pilotage service for 48 hours.

Mr. REID suggested that they were a little ahead of themselves. They talked about the meeting as if negotiations were going to break down. The Union men, like the U.K. pilots, thought the meeting on the following Monday night might be a strategic move by the Chamber of Shipping.

Mr. GARNER said that at the last U.K. Conference it was considered inopportune to go for a surcharge for bank holidays, etc. because there was some prospect of agreement being reached. Now, however, was the time to go in for surcharge for weekend and holiday work, and for the number of hours a pilot might be expected to work to be specified.

Mr. GLASSBOROW said that these new suggestions would provide just the ammunition the shipowners wanted. They would say "This is something new, we must have time to consider it."

Mr. WITHERS agreed that there should be payment for extra services, but if they tied down their representatives to ask for that it might interrupt all the good work which had been done.

Mr. DUNCAN felt that the level of earnings scheme was the basis of all these other matters and they should not cloud the issue with anything else until after January 1st. He, in fact, favoured November 1st as the date line.

Mr. TATE thought the other matters would be a stumbling block, but Mr. Reid suggested that they could be "shots in the locker."

The following resolution was drafted by Mr. O'Leary: "This joint representative body of all the pilots of the United Kingdom having heard the report on national negotiations regarding earnings, hereby resolve that failing satisfactory conclusion in the near future, a meeting of every pilot be held in London to consider the steps necessary to achieve their object."

Mr. TAYLOR thought the resolution was quite strong enough, but they must all be prepared to implement it.

A Liverpool pilot said they hoped they would not be called upon to go to this last resort, but if they were they would be acting as one.

Mr. O'LEARY said he gathered from conversations that it was felt that the shipowners had asked for the next meeting with the idea of stalling them, but he recalled that when the

letter was sent to the Chamber of Shipping suggesting the matter be put before the Ministry, it resulted in a telephone call from Mr. Horner who said they would be happy to try to bridge the gap.

"No man is entitled to give notice that he is going to fail to do his duty," Mr. O'Leary continued. "You regard your calling as being a duty where you are a cut above other people. You are doing a good job of work and not spending too long over it; you should be fairly well paid. You have a duty to your calling to the nation and to the shipping industry on which this nation depends. It is also the duty of shipowners to see that you are properly rewarded. They seem to think it their duty to regard the pilot as a self-employed person to be taken down from the hook when required. If you once start talking about overtime rates and special pay for weekend work you reduce yourselves down to the level of an artisan."

"You must regard yourselves not as labourers but as professional men. Stand on your dignity and don't think you will lose your dignity by standing also for what you are entitled to, and don't make the mistake of thinking you are entitled to the earth. We ought to be able to secure what we want upon the merits of the case. If there is no alternative (and this is the basis of the resolution) and no progress made because the authorities couldn't care less about you, you will have to stand up and say: 'This is what we want and we are prepared to obtain it.' You have to muster your forces in case of need, but I hope you will never need to use them. You must remain a tightly knit body of men, and you may be surprised at the effect you can have on the opposition."

The resolution was put the meeting and carried.

Mr. HOLMAN pictured the situation which would arise at the ports if all the pilots attended the meeting, and suggested that the ports should send representatives. "We are 129 pilots," he said, "and we could not leave the station *en masse*."

Mr. WYNN said he wouldn't like any of them to go back to their districts and get into trouble for having voted on something on which they had no right to vote.

Mr. WITHERS: In Bristol we had a similar occurrence and were out for a week. That is one port on its own and although we hope it will not come to it I would never hesitate to do it again.

Mr. BERRY: Like Bristol, we were out for a brief time. A lot of fears were expressed in our district but I never felt more appreciated as a pilot than after that experience.

Mr. TAYLOR said that surely the idea of their action was to show the authorities and shipowners what a responsible body of men who had never done such a thing before were prepared to do. It was a method of showing people that there was something seriously wrong with pilotage.

THREE NOTABLE RETIREMENTS

SEPTEMBER saw three notable retirements—Mr. Bernard C. Webb from the honorary treasurership of the Association, Mr. H. B. Eagle from the Executive Committee and from the Southampton service and Mr. Richard Wilkinson a well known figure on the East Coast, from the Sunderland service. All members will join in wishing them many years of health and happiness.

Mr. Bernard C. Webb



When Mr. Webb retired from the Clyde pilotage service in 1945, *The Pilot* had a very interesting article on "The House of Webb" which took the family history back to his great grandfather, William Webb, who was born at Yarmouth, I.O.W. in 1775 and became King's Pilot and, on the accession of Queen Victoria, Queen's Pilot. His son and his son's son (B.C.W.) also went into the pilotage service. Since that article was published B.C.W. has told us of even earlier William Webbs who became shipmasters.

Our Mr. Webb went to sea at the age of 16 in the *Mermers*. Four years later, in 1895, he obtained his second mate's certificate and joined the Donaldson line trading between Glasgow and Canada. After serving in different officer grades he passed for master in 1898. In May, 1900, when just under 25 years of age and nine years from the date of his going to sea, he received his first command, the *Concordia*. Four years later he was promoted to the *Kastalia* and in the same year was granted a commission in the Royal Naval Reserve.

In 1906 he entered the Clyde pilotage service and immediately joined the U.K.P.A. He took over the local secretarship about 1910 and continued in that office until under war conditions he was transferred to

Lamlash, Isle of Arran, in 1940. At the Swansea Conference in 1925 he was elected to the Executive of the Association and became senior vice-president in 1932 when Mr. Richard A. Lewis retired. On the death of Mr. Lewis in 1945 he was elected honorary treasurer, the office from which he retired last September. He remains an honorary vice-president of the Association, an honour first conferred on him at the 1945 Conference.

On the Clyde he was choice pilot for Frank C. Strick and Co. and their American agencies for 22 years. In his 28 years as a pilot on that waterway he carried out more than 11,000 acts of pilotage. For 20 consecutive years he was a representative of the pilots on the Clyde Pilotage Authority.

For our picture of Mr. Webb in the prime of life we have had to go back many years. It appeared in *The Pilot* after the Glasgow Conference in 1929. Happily the subject has not suffered so much by keeping as the photographic print! Members who have not seen him lately have our assurance that his complexion is as clear as ever and the hand of time has dealt very kindly with him.



Mr. H. B. Eagle, Southampton

There has been remarkably little change in Mr. Eagle in the 17 years we have known him as a member of the Executive Committee. Now, at an almost unbelievable 70 years of age, he has retired from the service in which he spent two months short of 39 years. The date of retirement was September 30.

Harry Eagle began his sea career 53 years ago; entered the Trinity House Isle of Wight District Inward Pilotage Service in 1917 and joined the U.K.P.A. in the same year. He was appointed choice pilot and North Sea pilot to the Canadian Pacific Steamship Co. in 1924 and remained with them until promoted to the Southampton Service. In June, 1924, he was appointed to the Norddeutscher Lloyd Bremen Co. and continued with them as a Southampton pilot until 1939.

He was appointed to the New Zealand Steamship Co. in May 1937, and held that position until his retirement. His association with Messrs. Thomas Meadows & Co., shipping agents—over 32 years—is among one of the oldest in the port.

Mr. Richard Wilkinson, Sunderland.



On September 15, Mr. Richard Wilkinson, senior, a well-known Sunderland pilot, retired after 53 years in the service. Entering it as an apprentice in 1903 he gained his licence in 1910 and is the last of the Sunderland pilots to have served his apprenticeship in steam and sailing vessels.

When war broke out in 1914, Mr. Wilkinson returned to the Mercantile Marine and served as second and chief officer. He was awarded the Lloyds medal and diploma for services rendered during the war and resumed his pilotage duties in 1919.

In 1923 he was appointed local secretary for the U.K.P.A. at Sunderland. He held that office for 28 years and attended many Conferences at London, Hull, Newcastle and various other places. He gave up the position in 1951 owing to ill health. Mr. Wilkinson was pilots' representative on the Sunderland Pilotage Authority and was awarded the Coronation Medal in 1953.

Mr. Stanley Hall who is now local secretary at Sunderland pays this tribute to him: "Mr. Wilkinson commanded great respect from his colleagues and indeed, from all his personal contacts. He was the bulkhead for the Association at this port and because of his far-seeing and untiring

efforts Sunderland pilots have remained strong in membership to the Association. His retirement will be a considerable loss not only to the service, but to the Association of which he has been a member for 46 years."

EVE OF CONFERENCE EXECUTIVE MEETING

THE Executive Committee at their eve of Conference meeting on September 25 heard from Mr. Griffiths an account of the conversation Mr. O'Leary and he had had with the representatives of the Chamber of Shipping. They reached the stage when after consultation with Mr. Tate and Mr. Clement a letter was sent to the Chamber saying that certain proposals of the shipowners were unacceptable as they amounted to a complete abandonment of the principles upon which they had been working, and adding that they had no further proposals to make.

"We realised," Mr. Griffiths said, "that in writing that letter we were pretty well slamming the door; we felt we had reached the limit. The immediate effect was a call from the Chamber suggesting a further talk."

Arising out of that came a proposal to invite Mr. O'Leary and delegates from the Union ports who would be meeting in London at the time to a joint session with the U.K.

pilots after Conference on the second day with the object of adopting a resolution which would make it clear to all concerned that they were dealing with a united body of pilots.

The Executive Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Chairman (Mr. Tate), seconded by Mr. Innes that Mr. Griffiths and Mr. O'Leary should attend the further talk "on their own."

The joint meeting of the two bodies of pilots was also confirmed by the Executive on the motion of Mr. Innes who said he was delighted at the idea, seconded by Mr. Grainger who considered it a "very good move."

Inevitably the subject of the negotiations came into the discussion on the Secretary's report which was read by Mr. Griffiths on the first morning of the Conference. An account of this debate follows Mr. Griffiths's report on another page.

RECEPTIONS ABOARD "WELLINGTON" and at TRINITY HOUSE

THE U.K.P.A. held a reception on board *H.Q.S. Wellington* after the first day of Conference, September 26. The guests were received in the lobby of the Court Room by the President with whom was Mr. Griffiths.

The invitation was accepted by the following:

Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation: Mr. D. S. R. Nobes, Miss P. R. Creeth.

Trinity House: Captain D. Dunn, Captain and Mrs. G. P. McCraith, Captain C. St. G. Glasson, Mr. and Mrs. R. S. McLernon, Mr. and Mrs. S. Rawlings Smith, Mr. and Mrs. E. S. Babbs.

Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom: Mr. and Mrs. K. R. Pelly, Mr. and Mrs. H. E. Gorick, Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Oades, Captain and Mrs. J. L. Watson, Chamber's Pilotage Committee.

London Pilotage Committee: Mr. and Mrs. W. MacGillivray.

Honourable Company of Master Mariners: Captain and Mrs. Spriddell, Captain and Mrs. G. C. Saul, Mr. and Mrs. W. T. C. Smith.

Sir Peter Macdonald's Guests: Mr. and Mrs. J. Arbuthnot, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Kirk, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Kershaw.

Transport and General Workers' Union: Messrs. Arthur Bird, T. O'Leary, J. Clement.

Other acceptances were: Wing Commander and Mrs. Paul C. Webb, D.F.C. and Mr. J. Basil Watling.

A very cordial atmosphere prevailed and towards the close there was a little speech making.

"This young chap Webb," said Sir Peter Macdonald, has been a member of this Association for half a century—not out. He is retiring and it is with mixed feelings that we make this presentation. We hate losing him but we hope he will always keep in touch. Eventually he became treasurer—that is why he is retiring now! It is my pleasant duty to present him with this pocket book with a cheque inside on behalf of the Association and to wish him every happiness in his retirement."

MR. WEBB, who was received with hearty applause, said he always thought Sir Peter was a Canadian of Scottish descent, but he appeared to have been born in the vicinity of the Blarney Stone! He went on to recall his early days at sea—he was a master at 24—and his entry into the pilotage service. He had been called many things while in the service but however true they were he was sorry to be cutting away now. The advance in the membership of the Association under the leadership of Sir Peter was a matter of

great satisfaction and he complimented him on being the chief of a very highly qualified and able body of expert seamen and hoped he would long remain the President of the United Kingdom Pilots' Association. Pilotage was not a tax upon shipping, but an institution for its benefit. This was maintained by Marsden, the great authority on pilotage, when the Act was being compiled. Mr. Webb also referred to the great pride he felt in having this "winding up" aboard *Wellington*, the headquarters' ship of the Master Mariners who were good enough to allow them to use it. The Merchant Navy and the pilots were of one cloth and they had never gone on strike. May that ever be so.

MR. MACGILLIVRAY who was introduced as a distinguished guest, repudiated the idea and called himself one of the back room boys. The distinction, he said, really belonged to Mr. Pelly who had just left the party. Mr. MacGillivray entertained the company with some breezy stories and struck a serious note when he said: "I have a great affection for the pilots, especially Trinity House pilots."

* * * * *

The Corporation of Trinity House invited the officers and members of the Executive Committee of the Association to a reception at Trinity House on September 27. The guests were received by the Deputy Master, Sir Gerald Curteis, K.C.V.O., R.N. (Retd.) with whom were the following Elder Brethren: Captains D. Dunn (Chairman of the Pilotage Committee), W. R. Chaplain, C. St. G. Glasson and G. P. McCraith.

Trinity House officials present were: the Secretary, Mr. T. H. Burleigh, M.A.; the Deputy Secretary, Mr. R. S. McLernon, O.B.E.; Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. P. W. Hunt, M.I.C.E.; Surveyor of Shipping, Mr. W. D. Seaman; Principal, Lights Department, Mr. A. W. Nicholls; Principal, Corporate Department, Mr. G. D. D'Ombraim, A.C.A.; Principal, Pilotage Department, Mr. S. Rawlings Smith, O.B.E., M.Inst.T.; Chief Accountant, Mr. J. R. A. Savage; Deputy Principal, Corporate Department, Mr. V. G. Stamp; Deputy Principal, Pilotage Department, Mr. E. Babbs and Public Relations Officer, Mr. A. R. W. Ransley.

London Pilotage Committee were represented by Mr. W. MacGillivray (shipowners' representative) and Messrs. W. J. Glassborow, R. V. Palmer, J. P. Young, H. A. Garner, M.B.E. (pilots' representatives).

From the Ministry of Transport came Mr. A. Broadley, O.B.E., Chief Executive Officer, and from the Chamber of Shipping, Sir J. Gibson Graham, M.C., Chairman Pilot-

age Committee; Messrs. H. E. Gorick, C.B.E., General Manager; L. J. H. Horner, Assistant General Manager; J. B. Greenwood, Secretary Pilotage Committee.

Other guests included Mr. A. Dickson Blake, former Principal of the Pilotage Department.

The Deputy Master welcomed the guests. It was not the time or place, he said, to refer to matters on which they could not see eye to eye. Referring to some passages in Mr. Griffiths's report regarding Pilotage Authorities and the negotiations, Sir Gerald said that Trinity House had always known where they stood as the principal Pilotage Authority.

CLYDE INQUIRY

THE Clyde Inquiry took place at the Ministry of Transport on November 7.

The pilots' claim was for net earnings of £1,800 inclusive of earnings outside the District. The principal arguments on which they based their claim were:

(1). That the earnings and subsistence allowance of the master of a representative vessel for their District was approximately £2,000.

(2). That in the agreed order of precedence of ports the Clyde was in the same group as Liverpool, and slightly above as far as the tonnage of the representative ship is concerned.

(3). That on the basis of the Manchester test two and a half times pre-war earnings amounted to £1,847.

The Pilotage Authority and the Chamber of Shipping at one time took different views as to the appropriate figure for the port, but by the time the inquiry was held they had agreed on a level of £1,550 excluding outside earnings which vary considerably but in round figures might be in the region of £50.

The decision of the Minister is awaited.

REFRESHING!

AT a time when so many cross-currents are running and criticisms are flying around it must have come as a pleasant surprise for Mr. Griffiths to receive a letter from a pilot containing these passages:—

Nothing will induce us to name the writer.

"... The meeting was conducted most fairly and amicably, and saw our case admirably and at time brilliantly expounded by Mr. Rawlings Smith, leading one to assume a favourable impression of our chances. ...

"May I offer one impression left with me, an initiate to these proceedings, of our inquiry; firstly, the charm, tact and understanding attitude of the Chairman, Mr. Faulkner, matched only by his keen, intuitive, penetrating questioning aided by an obvious desire to be fully acquainted with all opinions and facts from both parties in an inquiry lasting almost two hours, and, secondly, although diametrically opposed of course to our assessment, I found Mr. Greenwood's reasoning, views and presentation of his case most efficiently handled by him, and, within the prescribed limits of his formula instructions from the Chamber, performed admirably and completely without malice: suffice it to say, however, I hope we put up a stronger case! ..."



OBITUARY

Mr. John Newall, Channel

The Channel pilots lost a much liked colleague by the death in Gravesend and North Kent Hospital on September 11, after a long illness, of Mr. John Newall.

He was born in Wigtownshire in 1892. His family moved to Liverpool during his childhood and he went to sea at the age of 14 as apprentice in the full-rigged ship *Buccleuch*. He obtained his first certificate at an early age and at 19 was second mate of the barque *Dunreggan*.

After obtaining his master's certificate, he served in a number of steamships, being in the old Allan Line, since absorbed by the Canadian Pacific, at the outbreak of the first world war. In 1917, he transferred to the Anglo-American Oil Co. and while serving as a junior officer, received a Belgian decoration for gallantry in a mid-ocean rescue. At one time, he commanded the well-known *Iroquois* towing the large unpowered *Havohoe* in the North Atlantic trade.

In April, 1927, Mr. Newall joined the Channel Pilot Service and for the last 18 years acted as choice pilot for the Port Line.

"Jack Newall will long be remembered," writes one of his colleagues, "not only by his colleagues, but by all who met him, for his never-failing sense of humour. His ability to

lighten the most serious situation made him a valued shipmate who will be sorely missed."

Mr. O. File, Cinque Ports

We also heard with regret of the death of Mr. OSMOND FILE. He entered the Trinity House pilotage service in February, 1916, and retired owing to ill-health in January, 1947.

"Osmond was very popular with his colleagues" writes the Cinque Ports secretary, Mr. Robert Percy, "and his presence in rough weather was like a tonic."

Mr. File had some exciting experiences in his career. He went to sea in March, 1898, and became fourth mate of the barque *Vimera*. He was a junior officer in the *Pericles* when she was lost after striking an uncharted rock off Cape Lewin in 1908. Then he had adventures in the Solomons where his ship stranded when her cargo of coconuts caught fire.

The *Empress of Ireland* disaster in the St. Lawrence in 1914 is within the memory of many pilots. File was her second officer.

At the outbreak of the first world war he was one of a skeleton crew which took the *Montrose* from Liverpool to be sunk as a block ship.

He was first officer of the *Missanabie* at the end of 1915 when he was called to the pilotage service. During his early training he was aboard the *Elgie Manor* when she was torpedoed.

In July of this year he went into hospital at Sudbury where he died on September 16.

Lord Dulverton, Honorary Vice-President

LORD DULVERTON, who died on Dec. 2 at the age of 76, had been an honorary vice-president of the U.K.P.A. for very many years. He was first elected when as Sir Gilbert Wills he represented a Somerset constituency in Parliament as a Conservative.

He was a son of Sir Frederick Wills, the first baronet, whom he succeeded in 1909 and

was created a baron in 1929. From 1924 until 1947 he was chairman of the Imperial Tobacco Company and in the latter year became its president.

Like many members of the Wills family he was a regular and munificent donor to charity, although his gifts were frequently unpublicised.

Local Secretaries :

Aberdeen	W. A. Gervaise	Aberdeen Harbour Pilots, North Pier, Aberdeen
Ardrossan	A. Knox	Pilot Office, The Harbour, Ardrossan
Barrow-in-Furness	S. Green	63, Furness Park Road, Barrow-in-Furness
Barry	F. W. Llanfear	6, Clement Place, Barry, Glam.
Belfast	G. D. Clelland	Twelve Trees, Galway Park, Dundonald, Co. Down
Berwick-upon-Tweed	T. N. Richardson	Pier House, Berwick-upon-Tweed
Boston, Lincs.	A. V. Howard	25, Main Ridge, Boston, Lincs.
Brixham	E. J. Mardon	Ridley, Berry Head Road, Brixham
Cardiff	S. L. Duggan	Polwithen, Pen-y-Bryn Road, Cyncoed, Cardiff
Clyde (Gourock)	D. M. Main	Ashtower, 22, Victoria Road, Gourock
Cinque Ports	Robert S. Percy	60, Leybourne Road, Dover
Dartmouth	R. R. Gatzias	24, Lower Street, Dartmouth
Falmouth	E. Carlyon	Pilot Boat Association, 14, Arwenak Street, Falmouth
Fowey	M. Hingston-Randolph	Lamorna, Fore Street, Polruan-by-Fowey, Cornwall
Glasgow	J. H. Innes	20, Elie Street, Glasgow, W.2.
Gloucester	L. C. Taylor	Pilotage Office, Sharpness, Glos.
Goole	W. H. Perry	48, Silverdale Road, Hull
Grangemouth	A. McArthur	Pilot Office, The Docks, Grangemouth
Gravesend (Sea)	G. L. Baker	38, Whitehill Lane, Gravesend
Hartlepool	T. Pounder	16, Gladstone Street, Hartlepool.
Harwich	K. C. Davis	9, Queen's Road, Dovercourt
Hull	D. Grainger	Humber Pilots' Society, 50, Queen Street, Hull
Ipswich	W. Steele	45, Dereham Avenue, Ipswich
Isle of Wight (Inw'd)	L. G. Forman	25, Union Street, Ryde
King's Lynn	N. D. Smith	141, Wotton Road, King's Lynn
Leith	G. Duncan	1, Bangholm Villas, Edinburgh
London (River)	J. H. Fife	Saga, 28, Northbridge Road, Gravesend
Londonderry	C. M. O'Donnell	3, Oakfield Drive, Londonderry.
Middlesbrough	W. E. Guy	27, Barker Road, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough
Newhaven	W. Cross	62, Hill Crest, Newhaven, Sussex
Penzance	A. de Rauffignac	Pilots' Lookout, South Pier, Newlyn
Plymouth	E. Rogers	Pilot Office, 2, The Barbican, Plymouth
Poole	A. W. James	15, Harbour Hill Crescent, Poole, Dorset
Portsmouth	W. F. N. Quinton	Trinity House Pilots, Victoria Pier, Portsmouth
Port Talbot	E. Hare	8, Bath Street, Port Talbot.
Preston	H. Halsall	Pilotage Office, The Docks, Preston, Lancs.
St. Ives	R. J. Martin	Trewyn, Higher Syr, St. Ives
Sheerness	G. H. Taylor	56, Minster Road, Sheerness
Shoreham	A. J. Blaker	26, Glebe Close, Southwick, Sussex.
Southampton	K. J. Hutchings	Pilot Office, 18, Queen's Terrace, Southampton
South Shields	R. Marshall	Pilot Office, South Shields
Sunderland	S. Hall	Pilot Office, Old North Pier, Harbour Entrance, Sunderland
Trent	R. Acaster	30, Cranbrook Avenue, Cottingham Road, Hull
Workington (Whitehaven and Maryport)	J. R. Tennant	Brooklyn, Crow Park, Whitehaven, Cumberland
Wisbech	E. M. C. Dale	90, Edinburgh Drive, Wisbech
Yarmouth	C. Bewley	35, Sussex Road, Gorleston-on-Sea, Yarmouth