

N<sup>o</sup>  
149

# The Pilot

(OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS' ASSOCIATION)

No. 2 Vol. 43

February, 1966



## CAPTAIN INNES AT BUCKINGHAM PALACE

*Captain J. H. Innes with his wife and daughter, Heather Anne, photographed outside Buckingham Palace on Tuesday, 26th October, 1965, after he received his O.B.E. which was announced in the Queen's Birthday Honours, 1965. Miss Innes who is a qualified riding instructor ran her own riding school in Scotland for three years before she went to Missouri to run a riding academy. She is now with the Equine Research Department of Glasgow University. Her hobbies are hunting, music and art. Her brother Alisdair was a farmer in Scotland for five years before going to Wyoming to marry. Two years ago Mr. and Mrs. Innes went out to the christening of their son's second daughter in Laramie Cathedral. He is general manager of the Mid West Wool Corporation in Kansas City.*

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 1965/1966 OF THE  
**United Kingdom Pilots' Association**

**President :**

THE RT. HON. JAMES CALLAGHAN, M.P.

**Honorary Vice-Presidents :**

THE HON. LADY INSKIP	MAJOR JAMES BURNIE
SIR IRVING ALBERY	CAPTAIN W. H. COOMBS, C.B.E.
MR. G. N. RICHARDSON, O.B.E.	MR. J. H. FIFE

**Vice-Presidents :**

D. H. TATE, M.B.E. (Teess), 266, Acklam Road, Middlesbrough  
Middlesbrough 88125.  
H. J. WYNN (London, River), 52, Malvina Avenue, Gravesend,  
Gravesend 2228.

**Trustees :**

C. CATTON                      A. A. HOLLAND                      H. B. EAGLE

**Honorary Treasurer :**

H. J. WYNN

**Executive Committee :**

*Date elected:*

1963	S. GREEN (Barrow), 2, Prospect Avenue, Barrow-in-Furness.	Barrow 1401.
1963	T. W. FLEMING (Clyde, Gourock), 5, Ashton Road, Gourock.	Gourock 32106.
1963	G. W. DUNN (Humber), 7, Grove Lane, Waltham, Grimsby.	Waltham 3393.
1964	R. D. BALMAIN (London River), 24 Pine Avenue, Gravesend.	Gravesend 4796.
1964	C. A. RHODES (Medway), 19 Glenwood Drive, Minster-on-Sea, Sheerness.	Minster Sheppey 3287.
1964	P. A. LEVACK (Gravesend, Channel), 29 Hillingdon Road, Gravesend.	Gravesend 5254
1965	R. H. FARRANDS (North Channel), 451, Main Road, Dovercourt.	Harwich 2611.
1965	G. W. GIBBINS (Sunderland), 1, Featherstone Street, Roker.	Sunderland 3049.
1965	T. MORGAN (Cardiff), 97, Maes-y-Coed Road, Heath, Cardiff.	Cardiff 62502.

**Finance Committee :**

THE TWO VICE-PRESIDENTS

**General Secretary and Solicitor :**

C. D. GRIFFITHS, O.B.E., D.F.C., Shannon Court, Corn Street, Bristol 1. Bristol 21452.

**Auditor :**

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

**Editor of "The Pilot" :**

ALFRED CURTHOYS, 25 Grand Drive, S.W.20. LIBerty 7376.

## THE CONFERENCE – AND AFTER

It is now more than three months since the 1965 Conference of the U.K.P.A. and some explanation of the delay in presenting this issue of *The Pilot* is called for. Possibly the Editor had heard so much about the hazards of some pilot ladders that he did not think of the dangers of an ordinary staircase at home, and missing his footing or the handrail was under hospital treatment for several weeks. Fortunately no bones were broken but an arm out of action can be a handicap.

Since the Conference there have been two meetings of the Executive Committee, one immediately following the last session on 21st October when the resolutions which had been adopted were considered. Regarding the resolution on choice pilotage, the Executive Committee came to the conclusion that as there was clearly a lack of unanimity on this question they were left with no alternative other than to invite pilots at member ports where a strong majority existed in favour of the abolition of choice work, to take the matter up with their Authority, and, if they failed to obtain their support, themselves to lodge an application under Section 18 of the Pilotage Act for the revocation of the choice pilotage byelaws. The assistance of the Association would, of course, be forthcoming in all cases where the general body of pilots were of the same view. They should, of course communicate with Mr. Griffiths.

There are very great practical difficulties about implementing the Isle of Wight (Inward) resolution concerning the reimbursement of pilots for losses in implementing pay awards. The Chamber of Shipping maintain that once an Authority submits the draft bye-laws they are never responsible for delay, and they would object to a surcharge being imposed at a later date which might fall upon shipowners who had not even been using the port in question during the period the delay occurred. There is little doubt that the trouble lies at Authority level, and where local pilots are 'on the ball' and have the right liaison with the Authority's Secretary, a great deal can be done to avoid delay. Perhaps not surprisingly, Middlesbrough is the best example of what can be achieved, where bye-laws for the agreed percentage increase are usually submitted within 24 hours of the receipt by their Authority of official notification from the Board of Trade. As will be seen from the correspondence which is published as Appendix II(A) to his Annual Report, Mr. Griffiths did what he could to eliminate avoidable delay on the most recent occasion by his letter dated 18th February, 1965 to all Pilotage Authorities (which was also signed on behalf of the Union).

Following the distribution to delegates at Conference of the Government Actuary's Report on pensions which had been received on the day before, it was agreed that delegates should take copies back to their ports for detailed consideration of its proposals, and that all ports should communicate direct with Mr. Tate with their comments. He is busy working on these problems at the moment.

The other Executive meeting was held on the 18th January, 1966 when various problems were discussed, but they will be dealt with in a subsequent issue of *The Pilot*. For their diaries, however, members might like to know that the dates chosen for the Conference at Hull this year are 26th and 27th October with an Executive meeting on the 25th.

Reverting to the 1965 Conference, some of the matters discussed did not arise out of resolutions, in fact, it might be said that the main theme was in a word Productivity. This appeared on the agenda as item No. 5, "Productivity" and the Pilotage Service. Free time – manning requirements – systems of work. But long before we reached that Mr. Griffiths had some very weighty words to say on the

matter in his Report. This subject really dealt with two things. First, that the manning arrangements on every station should be such that every pilot had at least 100 days free of obligations for duty, and secondly, that the system of work should be so organized that the best and most efficient use was made of available manpower when men were on duty. If the pilots at any member port experience difficulty in getting their Authority to adjust their numbers to enable them to have proper free time they should at once get in touch with Mr. Griffiths for him to take the matter up on their behalf.

The President left no doubt in anybody's mind of his interest in the pilots, but his heavy Ministerial responsibilities naturally had to come first in the demands on his time. Nevertheless he managed to get along towards the close of the first session and addressed the meeting, touching on a number of the subjects that were being discussed. He paid a generous tribute to Mr. Tate for so adequately taking the chair. He said he kept in touch with Mr. Griffiths and the progress of the Association and admitted that *The Pilot* was among his bedside reading!

The U.K.P.A. reception on 20th October, 1965 was held for the first time at the Royal Commonwealth Society, Northumberland Avenue and the President who was accompanied by Mrs. Callaghan spent quite a time chatting with the guests. On the previous evening the Deputy Master and Elder Brethren in the historic atmosphere of Trinity House received the Officers and Executive Committee of the U.K.P.A. who had spent most of the day at their pre-Conference meeting.

Mr. Wynn had a particularly welcome news item in his annual report as Treasurer when he said that the membership had increased by 45 last year and now stood at 1,036. He gave a very good account of the Association's finances which for the first time included the subscription to E.M.P.A. Here the expense was within the estimate.

It seemed that on this occasion more of the pilots had put their thoughts on various subjects into writing and in the subsequent pages it will be noted that we have reproduced some of these speeches in full. The result of these prepared speeches was that the arguments were quite clear and in practically every case they were received with enthusiasm, in fact, no Conference has produced more applause for the speakers.

All the officers were re-elected and Messrs. Farrands and Gibbins were re-appointed to the Executive Committee, the only change there was the retirement of Mr. Slade who of course could not seek re-election. The vacancy on the Executive, however, was filled by Mr. Tom Morgan, another Cardiff pilot. All the officers attended Conference and a list of the delegates and visitors appears on the next page.

The delegates and visitors attending Conference were:

BARRY	- - - -	J. Bennett; R. T. Booker; C. E. Trueman. <i>Visitor</i> : O. C. Taylor.
BELFAST	- - - -	R. McGregor.
CARDIFF	- - - -	F. E. Davies; W. L. Harris; C. D. Morgan; T. Morgan.
CLYDE:		
GLASGOW	- - - -	J. E. Begg.
GOUROCK	- - - -	G. Munro.
GOOLE	- - - -	W. H. Perry; J. Wild.
HULL	- - - -	F. Berry; J. Myers; S. Smith; C. Wilkin; D. Barrett. <i>Visitors</i> : R. Campbell; H. Foulger; K. Ward; R. Carmichael.
ISLE OF WIGHT	- - - -	W. L. D. Bayley; J. A. Pellow; W. R. Steen; J. D. B. Wylie.
LONDON:		
CINQUE PORTS	- - - -	C. Eastwood; C. R. Dench; J. A. Edmondson; N. R. Knowles; H. P. M. Lawrence. <i>Visitor</i> : H. A. Garner.
GRAVESEND CHANNEL	- - - -	K. Y. Clow; A. Ion; N. P. Macfarlane; M. Mitchell; B. Newman.
LONDON RIVER	- - - -	J. M. Hanson; D. W. Hobday; E. J. Hobbs; D. I. McMillan; D. Perry.
MEDWAY	- - - -	T. Hannaford; R. H. Vallings.
NORTH CHANNEL	- - - -	A. Robinson; G. Lawson; A. Nunn; R. Sanders; A. Vaughan.
LONDONDERRY	- - - -	C. M. O'Donnell.
MIDDLESBROUGH	- - - -	H. A. Burton; G. A. Coates; S. V. Edge; A. Stanton; J. T. Taylor. <i>Visitors</i> : W. Garthwaite; A. Stevenson; L. Sidgwick.
MILFORD HAVEN	- - - -	H. W. Phillips.
PORTSMOUTH	- - - -	P. A. Hawkesworth.
PORT TALBOT	- - - -	E. L. Hare.
PRESTON	- - - -	E. N. Chambers.
SOUTHAMPTON	- - - -	B. Bell; C. J. G. Pearce; K. E. Powell; T. V. Stedman.
SUNDERLAND	- - - -	S. Hall; R. Wilkinson.
Retired: E. Ramsey (Tyne); G. H. Jackson (N. Channel); A. A. Holland (Gravesend Channel).		

"This Association would be completely failing in its duty if it did not make the strongest appeal to every body of pilots to examine their system of operating and to give willing consideration to any and every method or new practice calculated to improve efficiency and increase productivity."

### REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY AND SOLICITOR

THE LETCH AGREEMENT has now been in operation for just over eight years, and during this period the original levels of earnings at the ports dealt with have been increased by varying amounts on no less than six occasions, so that present day mean levels are as shown at Appendix I compared with the figures first adopted. By agreement with the shipowners, similar increases have been granted at the majority of the smaller ports not covered by the Committee's recommendations.

Because adjustments in N.M.B. scales of pay are not expressed in terms of percentage increases and by reason of the now well-known "fringe benefit" technique, it is no news to you that the task of the pilots' organizations in agreeing the amount of the percentage adjustment to be applied to pilotage rates has frequently been great, though just how great those of you who have not been intimately connected with the negotiations will never fully realise. It is not that there is the slightest desire on the part of shipowners' advisers to avoid the terms of their bargain, but because there genuinely can be room for more than one honest point of view.

Never was that more clearly illustrated than in the latest award which became operative in the Merchant Service at the end of March, but, despite our commencing negotiations in February (when the terms became known), did not result in agreement being reached till late May, with the inevitable consequence that at least another month to six weeks went by before bye-laws increasing rates could be brought into operation. The root of the difficulty lay in the fact that this time the changes involved a substantial revision in the whole salary structure of Merchant Service officers. I can, of course, fully understand the sense of frustration and natural impatience felt by anyone who is not receiving the money to which he is entitled, but what causes me concern is the total absence amongst the overwhelming majority of our members - the rank and file, if I may so describe them

- of any real knowledge of what was actually happening, of the steps the Executive were taking in an endeavour to avoid delay, and of the general progress of the negotiations and the deep problems in the way of arriving at a satisfactory settlement. We could of course have taken the easy way out and settled far sooner for far less, but that we were not prepared to do.

Honorary secretaries at member ports were kept closely informed, but it is often impossible for them to arrange for adequate distribution locally. This has frequently led me to believe that, if we could afford it, the employment of a public relations officer, part of whose duties would be to disseminate accurate information among our own members, would undoubtedly pay dividends and prevent subversive influences and mischief-makers (of whom alas, we seem to have our share) from spreading discontent and wholly unjustifiable dissatisfaction with the way in which their interests are being looked after. We all know the invariably noisy types, full of complaints but always short of solutions, who seem to think that what their case lacks in force of argument can be made good by the vigour of its assertion. They thrive in times of difficulty and make the task of their negotiators immeasurably more anxious and worrying, but would not survive for a moment if the real truth were known. In contrast with this, I gladly record my appreciation of the firm and sometimes forceful support we received from other important sections of our membership.

It is for this reason and because I think every member is entitled to be told the facts and something at least of the task involved, that, although all is now over, I am setting out at Appendix II an extract of the relevant correspondence whereby I endeavoured to keep ports fully acquainted of all that was going on, and when ultimately agreement was reached, to provide an explanation of what had been achieved. You will remember that my earlier letter to all ports dated 26th November, 1964, which envisaged the pos-

### Secretary's Report

sibility of an N.M.B. adjustment, has already been referred to in the January publication of *The Pilot*.

The joint letter from the Union and U.K.P.A. to all Pilotage Authorities dated 18th February, 1965, was prepared by me with the approval of the Executive Committee given at its meeting on 19th January, for the express purpose of doing everything in our power to prepare the ground beforehand in the hope of minimising delay in implementing the increase once the amount was known. The Union readily agreed to join in, and had it not been for the difficulties which subsequently arose in agreeing the percentage figure, I think it would have proved extremely effective.

It will take you a little time to read this correspondence, but before I leave the subject I desire to express on your behalf my appreciation of the prompt action once again taken by the Pilotage Department of Trinity House and the vast majority of other Authorities in submitting bye-laws to the Board of Trade. The Secretary of the Chamber's Pilotage Committee was equally co-operative, and although there was indeed (for reasons which I hope you now fully understand) an almost exasperating delay in reaching agreement as to the exact percentage figure, once this had been done no time was lost by all concerned in an effort to put it into operation.

#### The "Proper Number" of Pilots

From the correspondence referred to you will see that an interesting and vitally important by-product of these negotiations was the clearing up once and for all of certain factors of great significance from the standpoint of working conditions, which for convenience I would briefly like to summarize, viz.:-

1. The Chamber confirmed that the position prior to the present increase was -
  - (a) that pilots were entitled to 100 days per annum free of all obligations for duty; and
  - (b) that the "proper number" of pilots for the purpose of Clause 3 of the Letch Agreement should be arrived at on that basis.
2. That in the event of additional pilots being required to enable that amount of free time to be enjoyed, rates should

be adjusted to provide the current Letch mean for that increased number, and furthermore that this should be done forthwith without waiting for them to be actually licensed and commence sharing in the pool.

3. And this is new - that in order to bring conditions in the Pilotage Service more into line with the Merchant Navy, the working week should be reduced from five and a half days to five days of eight hours per day, thus increasing the entitlement to free time from 100 to 126 days per annum, it being understood, however, that if further pilots were licensed to enable this additional 26 days to be taken, there could be no compensatory rate adjustment as this was included in the agreed increase of 12%.

I hope it is not necessary for me to remind you that you have long ago been advised as to your rights in this respect, both by correspondence and in the course of former Annual Reports, and the value of arriving at an agreed work index (or its equivalent) has very frequently been emphasized. The plain fact, however, remains that in a surprising number of places an adequate establishment of pilots arrived at on the basis just referred to has never in fact been agreed, largely, I am told, because certain Authorities claim that they have not been officially acquainted of the understanding reached between shipowners and pilots as to the amount of off-duty time to which they are entitled. There can be no excuse for ever advancing this argument again, but the problem of adequate manning, where it exists, will require careful investigation to ensure that in all proper cases the position is put right, not only for the sake of the pilots concerned but in the interests of achieving as far as possible consistency in working conditions throughout the country. There is obviously something very wrong if, for example, in the case of two ports with a comparable level of earnings, the pilots at one have to work considerably longer hours in order to earn it than the pilots at the other. No two ports can be compared from the standpoint of the number of acts of pilotage per annum each has to perform to earn its Letch mean.

Secretary's Report

Conditions are infinitely variable, and therefore that is not a comparison of like with like. But there clearly should be as near as possible an equality of working hours throughout the entire service, and this of course brings me to a problem of very real difficulty with which I will do my best to deal, however briefly, at this stage.

**Increased "Productivity"**

How exactly is one to define for the purpose of assessing working hours just when a pilot is to be regarded as "on duty"? There are those autocratic die-hards still to be found on some Authorities who maintain that only time spent on the bridge should be taken into account. Such a contention is so ludicrous that I do not intend to waste time dealing with it. On the other hand, is there not in some quarters a tendency amongst certain pilots to claim to be on duty when theoretically on call, although in practice they know perfectly well they have many completely free hours ahead? If they feel they are right and that such a situation is no fault of theirs well and good, but has it ever occurred to them that perhaps their system of work could be more efficiently organized?

I am confident that the overwhelming majority of pilots are most anxious to reduce to a minimum the tedious, irksome and unproductive hours spent in standing by at home, watch-keeping, travelling, cruising and the like, and will co-operate with all concerned in cutting out as much of this "dead" time as possible. This, however, seems to me at any rate to some extent to be a major problem of re-organization and modernisation, and until it is carried into effect then clearly time spent in travelling, cruising and the rest must be counted as working hours, provided the working system is the best that can be devised in prevailing conditions. The necessary changes may indeed be a matter of long term policy, but it is hoped that the visit of the Elbe pilot cutter to the Pool of London during the E.M.P.A. meeting in May last, and the vast potential of a ship-to-ship and ship-to-shore helicopter service will not have passed unnoticed. The cost may seem great and its possible limitation due to weather and serviceability problems are only some of the factors doubtless to be taken into account,

but could anything be more out-dated, wasteful and costly than the maintenance of permanent sea stations and surface communications such as exist to-day in the London District and one or two places elsewhere? Whilst a fast and efficient modern pilot boat service will undoubtedly continue to be necessary at the majority of ports, it would certainly seem that the time might be ripe at least for examining ways and means of reducing the ever increasing and already vast expenditure which falls entirely upon the shipping industry (foreign and British, of course) of maintaining cruising stations and their attendant services off certain of our major ports, with the waste of man-power and hours of work unavoidably associated with this practice.

Leaving out these long term considerations, I venture to think this Association would be completely failing in its duty if it did not make the strongest appeal now to every body of pilots to examine their system of operating and to give willing consideration to any and every method or new practice calculated to improve efficiency and increase "productivity" – a word which in this particular context can, in my view, only mean being able to do, without any increase in actual time on duty, more ships per pilot, or, alternatively, the same number of ships with less pilots.

Do not imagine for one moment that I am unmindful of the consequences of possible redundancy arising from the introduction of more efficient and economical working arrangements. That would be very far from the truth, but I have good reason for saying that if an improved working system devised by the pilots – who, after all, rather hold the secret in their own hands – resulted in there being one or two surplus to requirements, the shipowners would maintain rates to protect earnings for existing numbers until they were reduced in the normal passage of time to the proper figure. In practice one hopes that situation would never arise and that instead increased traffic and greater national prosperity would automatically adjust the position. Let us, however, not speculate too deeply upon the consequences but concern ourselves (if I may borrow what I remember of the words of our President on a different occasion),

Secretary's Report

with ensuring that duty systems are so organized that everyone performs sixty minutes' honest work for every hour's pay. That, I am quite convinced, is the wish of every pilot, particularly in the light of the now undisputed entitlement to 126 free days per annum and a working week of 40 hours.

There are, therefore, two factors to be examined side by side – an examination of the working system to ensure it is as efficient and economical as it can reasonably be made, and, where hitherto there has been inadequate leave and free time, i.e. less than 100 days, the licensing of additional pilots (with a consequential rate adjustment to maintain earnings at the agreed level) to enable this to be done.

**Pensions**

Progress, though tangible, continues to be slow, and were it not for the dogged perseverance of Mr. Tate I am convinced would long ago have ceased altogether. Hesitation, bordering on suspicion if not actual obstruction, continues to exist in certain quarters, and in some instances there has been what is in effect a flat refusal to co-operate with the Government Actuary's Department by declining to answer his questionnaire. Pilotage Authorities, whose statutory function in this matter is to set up and administer the fund to the best advantage of the pensioners, seem to want a say over such questions as the amount of the pension in relation to earnings and the sources of the contributions to the fund. These are matters which are nothing whatever to do with them, more especially when they so largely seem to entrust complete responsibility for the expression of their views (if not indeed also for their formation) to their senior officials.

I am, however, happy to say that in June last, Sir Herbert Tetley, the Government Actuary, presided over a meeting at which Mr. Tate was present, and laid before those attending a confidential document headed "Outline of the Principal Features of a Possible National Superannuation Scheme for Maritime Pilots". Because of its confidential nature you will not expect me: this stage to discuss it here, but it has naturally been carefully considered by the Executive and certain selected pilots with knowledge and experience of the problem.

There was a fairly full exchange of views at this meeting, in the light of which it is understood the Government Actuary is now preparing his final report for presentation to the Board of Trade. No doubt the Board, after having been afforded an opportunity of studying it, will call another meeting with a view to arriving at the final draft of a broad outline for an agreed pension scheme for general circulation before summoning a fully representative meeting.

It is hoped that by the time we assemble at Conference further more positive news will be available, and meanwhile all I wish to reiterate is that it has already been agreed that the introduction of whatever scheme is finally decided upon will in no circumstances be allowed to prejudice or in any way operate to the disadvantage of those ports whose existing pension arrangements are on a reasonably favourable basis.

**Bulk Carriers - Manning and Equipment**

The important debate on this subject during last year's Conference was fully reported in the January *Pilot*, and indeed attracted considerable Press comment and correspondence at the time.

By way of getting to grips with the problem confronting those whose task is to handle these vessels in congested waters, the Executive felt that, as a first step towards the hoped for introduction of measures to obviate some at least of the difficulties, letters should be sent to the Chamber of Shipping, the Board of Trade and selected ports – the latter for the purpose of suggesting the keeping of records (a "tanker incident book") to enable me to quote specific examples of difficulties and their causes. You will also be aware that this same problem formed an important item for debate at the Annual Meeting of E.M.P.A.

I do not think I can do better than include at Appendix III copies of this correspondence also, which will show you just where we have got to date. I ought to add that my communications with the Board of Trade have carried the matter no further as their reaction, not unreasonably, was that before replying they would like to be informed of the Chamber's attitude. This I have now done by sending them a copy of the Chamber's letter of 24th May, which is at present receiving the Board's consideration.

*Secretary's Report*

The E.M.P.A. recommendations, which are being published in *The Pilot*, will go, via each member country's Government, to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, and we will also give them appropriate distribution in other quarters. It seems to me that this Association's resolution of last year and the contents of the subsequent correspondence should now be co-ordinated with the E.M.P.A. recommendations, and I will endeavour to obtain from the Board of Trade their guidance as to the precise steps to be taken and the order in which to take them in the hope that somewhere at some stage someone will decide to do at least something.

Over matters of this kind one can all too easily lose the substance for the shadow by an exchange of too much correspondence and general paper work (to use a polite expression), as the Medway pilots soon discovered when in April last they brought to the notice of the Thames Joint Consultative Committee the clearest possible illustration of the most glaring deficiencies affecting a tanker of over 700 feet in length and 37 feet draught, with a hopelessly inadequate mooring party fore and aft and a total absence of V.H.F. It was no time before the Committee had recommended the matter be referred to I.M.C.O. (with all the complicated procedural steps involved), although the pilots felt that simple action to reduce at least some of the difficulties could be taken at once by the straight-forward expedient of engaging local riggers.

Whilst in no sense do I seek to underestimate the complications and difficulties in reaching agreement upon recommendations which require international approval before they can be adopted, I am left with the impression that there is a tendency in some quarters to make the most of these difficulties instead of applying an obvious simple and instant remedy. Surely this is too urgent a matter to be dealt with just by passing the buck. We all know that ships, even of this class, are not equipped to a common standard, and it is perhaps hardly surprising that certain experienced and responsible pilots are already talking of having to discriminate against the less well equipped ships, resulting in their having to accept

delays and inconvenience unless the recommendations on this matter receive more serious attention. It may well become necessary, in co-operation with the pilots of the continental ports principally concerned and through the medium of E.M.P.A. to consider what steps it might be desirable to take in order to instil some sense of urgency into owners and operators of ships of this class. They and the associated oil interests at least cannot claim from now on to be unaware of the way in which both British and European pilots are thinking. I feel it my duty to make this quite plain on your behalf, but I hasten to add, as I know you would wish, that maximum co-operation will continue to be given by all pilots once there is some assurance that the important matters raised in the interests of safety are receiving serious consideration with a view to suitable remedies being applied at an early date.

**1960 Safety of Life at Sea Convention**

This Convention at long last came into operation in May of this year, and with it the new Merchant Shipping (Pilot Ladders) Rules. I am sure you will all welcome the co-operation we were afforded by the Board of Trade, and will be pleased to see the extent to which the pilots' requirements, as presented by Mr. Balmain on behalf of the Association, have been adopted.

Apart from the amendments to the rules which we have been successful in negotiating, there were a number of other points which Mr. Balmain pressed during the course of his meetings, including such matters as the roughening of treads, the provision of stanchions in connexion with arrangements for passing safely from the head of the ladder into the ship, care in the stowage of ladders, their maintenance and cleanliness, and the need to have life-buoys ready for immediate use. It was not felt that these particular matters were entirely suitable for inclusion in the rules themselves, but nevertheless their importance was fully recognised and I have received assurances from the Board that they will be covered in an M. Notice dealing with pilot ladders generally, which in due course will be circulated to owners, masters and crews. This notice will be prepared in draft and for-

*Secretary's Report*

warded to me to enable the comments of this Association to be made thereon.

Knowing the importance which every pilot rightly attaches to this vital matter, I am sure you will wish me to express to the officers of the Board of Trade with whom Mr. Balmain has been dealing our gratitude for the sympathetic and helpful manner with which the points he has raised have been treated.

**Pilots' Ombudsman**

My duties under this heading – and I hope I am not abusing the title – are far more extensive than most of you would imagine. Individual problems and personal claims or applications for advice are by r means uncommon, and I am prompted to refer to them only by reason of last year's resolution dealing with occasional action by Pilotage Authorities in excess of their jurisdiction. You have already been told through the columns of *The Pilot* that should an instance occur the aggrieved party should immediately communicate with me. I am at present dealing with a number of claims for personal injuries and loss of earnings arising through accidents at work, advice as to one's rights and liabilities in certain situations which have arisen, a case of wrongful disciplinary action and the remedy open to the pilot concerned, and the case of an individual pilot whose actual cash losses exceeded £500 (not counting substantial loss of expectation of earnings) as a result of action by his Authority in selecting him for appointment to a particular port and thereafter continually delaying and altering the date upon which he was ordered to report for duty, as a consequence of which he was ultimately left with no alternative but to withdraw.

In these two latter instances the full facts have been carefully investigated by the Executive Committee, and authority has been given to take all necessary action to protect the pilots' interests, even by the institution of proceedings if no satisfactory settlement can be arrived at and counsel so advises. I will say no more at this stage as I am confident there is a genuine desire on both sides to clear up misunderstandings and reach a fair settlement, but these particular tasks form an important and often

difficult part of the work I undertake on behalf of members, and I hardly need add, take up a considerable amount of time.

**General**

Arising out of my reference to the interests of individual pilots, it is perhaps not wholly inappropriate for me to mention a few current matters of the utmost importance affecting individual ports to which it is not my normal practice to refer, at any rate in any detail, in the course of this annual review unless some matter of policy or general principle is involved.

The plight of the Falmouth pilots, with the prolonged and repeated labour troubles at their docks, will, I am sure, not have gone unnoticed. For months the port has been at a virtual standstill, with the inevitable result as far as they are concerned. This was a matter of such importance that I appealed to our President for his intervention in so far as he felt able on their behalf, and at the time of preparing this report the steps now urgently being taken by the Minister of Labour look as if there is some prospect of a way out of the deadlock being found. I am sure every pilot in this Association wishes the Falmouth pilots a prolonged period of industrial peace at their port, to enable them to regain part of their losses and enjoy at least some of the prosperity to which this major tanker repair base is rightly entitled.

Interesting and complex problems have arisen in the Isle of Wight District by reason of the dredging of the new deep channel at the approach to the Nab, and the wish of the tanker Masters that their pilot should board several miles outside the limits. The operation of the Thoresen ferries also gives rise to delicate pilotage questions which could well have far-reaching consequences. These matters are in course of what we all hope will turn out to be entirely satisfactory settlement. All of us know that the perfectly legitimate and reasonable interests of pilots, even in the same District, can on occasions conflict. They did, to some extent, in this instance, and I would like to pay a very sincere tribute to the dignified and scrupulously fair manner in which these differences have been resolved as between the Inward and Outward Services. Credit is due to a

Secretary's Report

the pilots, but very particularly to the members of the respective committees whose task, I am the first to recognise has been far from simple.

The implementation at certain major ports of the recommendations of the Rochdale Committee in reducing the number of different dock and other authorities at certain industrial estuarial districts is steadily going on, and I am in close touch at the moment with the pilots both of the Clyde and the Humber. An important aspect at present in course of discussion is the very proper desire of the pilots to obtain suitable representation not only upon the Pilotage Committee (to which they are by law entitled), but also upon the local body responsible for the operation of the docks.

The future development of the South Wales ports is at the moment very much in the balance, but the outcome is of immense consequence both nationally and to the pilots at the individual ports concerned. Where the iron-ore terminal is eventually to be sited and whether there will be one, two, or even three, are matters of quite tremendous moment about which decisions cannot much longer be delayed. There is in addition the quite unrelated matter of a possible re-organization or even amalgamation of the Pilotage Districts of Barry, Cardiff and Newport, about which the Board of Trade are shortly holding an Inquiry. I hardly need say that all these are problems about which the pilots are in very close touch with me and are receiving my urgent attention.

I will conclude this inevitably rather disjointed review with a brief reference to two matters. The annual general meeting of E.M.P.A. has come and gone. A full report of it will be appearing in *The Pilot* which at the time of writing has not yet been published but which (I trust) will be in your hands long before you receive this. I will therefore confine myself to expressing publicly on your behalf what I have already done privately, namely, the gratitude of this Association to the Elder Brethren of Trinity House for the reception which they were good enough to hold for our visitors and their ladies, and my thanks to the many distinguished guests who attended our own reception and helped so pleasantly to make

it the success which the many letters I have since received assure me it was. The President's dinner party at the House of Commons brought the occasion to a fitting and formal conclusion, which I am sure will long be remembered by all who were privileged to attend.

Much has already been said in appreciation of the German pilots' enterprise in arriving in their own very fine cutter, and demonstrating the immense potential of helicopter communication. There can be no doubt that their visit performed a valuable service to all pilots in displaying the progress which can be achieved where there is bold and imaginative outlook.

Finally, may I express the earnest hope that a clear-cut decision can be arrived at during the course of this Conference, in the light of the letters and explanations which have been placed before you, concerning the proposed amalgamation of the two pilots' organizations.

C. D. GRIFFITHS.

31st August, 1965.

### APPENDIX I

#### AGREED MEAN LEVELS OF EARNINGS

	1957	1965
	£	£
Aberdeen	1,050	1,624
Barrow	1,250	1,934
Barry	1,200	1,857
Belfast	1,300	2,010
Cardiff	1,200	1,857
Clyde	1,650	2,552
Falmouth (Sea)	1,500	2,320
Goole	1,300	2,010
Grangemouth	1,225	1,895
Hartlepool	1,050	1,624
Hull	1,400	2,165
Ipswich	1,100	1,702
Isle of Wight (In)	1,575	2,437
Isle of Wight (Out)	1,825	2,824
London	1,850	2,863
Londonderry	950	1,469
Plymouth	1,100	1,702
Port Talbot	1,200	1,857
Preston	1,200	1,857
Sunderland	1,150	1,780
Tees	1,500	2,320
Tyne	1,150	1,780

Secretary's Report

## APPENDIX II

(A) Copy correspondence regarding the 1965 N.M.B. Adjustment and its application to the earnings of pilots.

#### UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS' ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

16th February, 1965.

Dear Local Secretary,

*1965 N.M.B. Adjustment*

Mr. Henderson and I are doing our best to reach the earliest possible agreement with the Chamber of Shipping as to the appropriate percentage increase to be applied to pilots' earnings to give effect to the most recent changes in the N.M.B. scales of pay for Navigating Officers, which are to come into effect at the end of March. The position is not free from complexities, but we are hoping to get this settled soon, and I will write to you again immediately the figure has been agreed.

In an endeavour to do what I can to obviate the delays which have occurred in the past, I have drawn a letter to all Pilotage Authorities, which Mr. Henderson has agreed to sign so that it goes to them as a joint appeal by both organizations to give this matter top priority. A copy is enclosed for your information, and no doubt your representative on the Authority will immediately get in touch with the Secretary to ensure that the appropriate action is taken without delay.

Yours truly,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: All Local Secretaries  
London Pilots Council  
Executive Committee  
Mr. Curthoys  
for information.

#### UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS' ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

#### TRANSPORT AND GENERAL WORKERS' UNION

Transport House,  
Smith Square,  
London, S.W.1.

18th February, 1965.

Dear Sir,

*The Letch Agreement and N.M.B. Adjustments*

You will, of course, be familiar with the provisions of the Letch Agreement whereby pilotage rates are to be adjusted in accordance with National Maritime Board variations in scales of pay for Navigating Officers. When such increases have been published in the past, the practice has been for the two pilots' organizations to seek the earliest possible agreement with the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom as to the appropriate percentage figure by which pilots' earnings shall be varied, and to let the Ministry of Transport (now the Board of Trade) know what that figure is.

You will be aware that the negotiations which have been going on for some time for a further increase in National Maritime Board scales of pay, including those of Navigating Officers, have recently been concluded, and the new rates will come into effect on 29th March next. The pilots' organizations have already opened discussions with the Chamber of Shipping for the purpose of agreeing the percentage figure necessary to bring about a corresponding increase in pilots' earnings, and immediately this has been settled the Board of Trade will be informed. They will then at once communicate with all Pilotage Authorities intimating that for the purpose of giving effect to the terms of the Letch Agreement current pilotage rates should be adjusted so as to increase by the agreed percentage figure that proportion of gross pilotage

Secretary's Report

which is attributable to pilots' earnings and pension contributions, provided net earnings for the preceding calendar year have fallen within the agreed tolerance of 10% above or below the recommended level for that period.

Despite the co-operation of the majority of Authorities, considerable delays have in the past occurred before bye-laws giving effect to the increase are brought into operation which it is appreciated, in common fairness all concerned are anxious to avoid. In the hope of eliminating or at least minimising the losses which result from these delays, we are writing to invite all Authorities, in connexion with the current N.M.B. Adjustment, to convene, if necessary, a special meeting to approve the submission of bye-laws to the Board of Trade for adjusting rates by such percentage figure as is mentioned in the Board's letter which we hope will shortly be in your hands. Draft bye-laws could then be immediately prepared, and on receipt from the Board of the letter above referred to, the appropriate figures inserted so that they can be submitted for confirmation at the latest within a matter of a day or so after the precise percentage adjustment becomes known. If this procedure could be followed there is no reason why, in the absence of complications which might arise in one or two individual cases, the increased pilotage rates should not be timed to take effect from the same date as the new N.M.B. scales of pay. We trust we may look to you for your complete co-operation towards this end.

A copy of this letter has been sent to the Board of Trade and the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) PETER HENDERSON,  
National Secretary,  
Transport and General  
Workers' Union.

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS,  
General Secretary,  
United Kingdom Pilots' Association.

To: All Pilotage Authorities.

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

24th February, 1965.  
Dear Local Secretary,

*1965 N.M.B. Adjustment*

Mr. Tate and I recognise fully the natural concern of every pilot to know what is being done about the percentage figure by which rates are to be varied to give effect to the increase in scales of pay in the Merchant Service which is to become operative at the end of March.

At his request I am writing to acquaint all members that, in co-operation with the Union, we are doing our utmost, and have already attended one meeting with their Executive Sub-Committee. There are, however, considerable difficulties because, once again, we are bedevilled with that portion of the award which the Shipowners claim does not fall within the terms of Clause 6(i) of the Letch Agreement. The total increase, including overtime, weekends at sea etc., (although official figures have not yet been published) is understood to be around 24%. The increase, when confined to the basic scale of pay, is as little as just over 1% - a completely negligible amount. You will all remember that when a somewhat similar situation arose in 1960 (when the Merchant Service got 22% and pilots 11%), we tested our claim before the Minister and lost. My views on that decision were expressed in my Annual Report published in the January 1963 *Pilot*.

From the above we hope you will understand that we have a tough fight on our hands. We are doing our best. We are meeting the Union and the Chamber of Shipping again next week, and will try to keep you fully informed of progress. Should we feel that an Emergency Executive Committee ought to be called we will not hesitate to do so.

Yours truly,  
(Signed) C.D. GRIFFITHS.

To: President, U.K.P.A.  
Executive Committee  
Local Secretaries  
Honorary Secretary, London  
Pilots' Council  
Mr. Curthoys (for information).

Secretary's Report

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.  
4th March, 1965.

Dear Member,

*1965 N.M.B. Adjustment*

Further to my letter of 24th February, a meeting has now taken place between representatives of the Union and the U.K.P.A. with the Chamber of Shipping, and as a consequence of the unsatisfactory outcome it has been decided to call a Joint Emergency Meeting of the Executive Committees of both pilots' organizations for 2 p.m. on Monday, 22nd March. As we have other important business to transact, our own Executive will meet on board the *Wellington* at 10 a.m. on that morning. This date has been arranged because the meeting of the Chamber's Pilotage Committee to deal with the current claim does not take place until Wednesday, 17th March, and we cannot expect to be informed of the outcome before Friday, 19th March. It however seems reasonable to assume that their decision will follow the advice they are likely to be given, the nature of which we were informally acquainted with during our recent conversations.

Clearly the first essential in considering our claim is to have an accurate knowledge of the facts, and I set out below a comparison between the existing scale for the appropriate Officer and the scale which will come into operation on 29th March next :-

PRESENT SCALE		
Monthly rate ... ..	£104. 10. 6.	
Saturday afternoon at sea compensation ...	£5. 4. 6.	
Consolidated basic ...	£109. 15. 0.	
NEW SCALE		
Monthly rate ... ..	£105. 13. 6.	
Weekend at sea compensation ...	£31. 14. 0.	
Consolidated basic ...	£137. 7. 6.	

The Shipowners claim, on the authority of the decision given by Sir Robert Letch in October 1960 and the Minister of Transport in May 1962, that for the purposes of Clause 6(i) of the Letch Agreement the expression "scales of pay" means, and is confined exclusively to, *the monthly rate*. They contend that compensation for Saturdays (or weekends) at sea is what for convenience has been described as fringe benefits, which on two previous occasions we have claimed and been disallowed. They therefore contend that the difference between the new monthly rate and the old monthly rate is all the pilots are strictly entitled to, which amounts to just over 1% - a figure which they themselves recognise can only be described as derisory. We naturally challenge this construction most strongly. I have already referred you to the history of this dispute which is set out on pages 5, 6 and 7 of the January 1963 *Pilot*, and in view of some grossly unfair observations which have been made to me, and to save unnecessary repetition, I can only ask you to do me the courtesy of reading what is there set out.

The Chamber - assuming for a moment that their construction was correct - are prepared to admit that in such circumstances Clause 6(i) has become completely unreal and has ceased to be a satisfactory yardstick for adjusting pilots' earnings because of the new and much more involved rate structure which has been largely brought into being by reason of the scarcity value of those who man the Merchant fleets. They appreciate that it would be quite wrong to offer pilots 1.1%, and they may well be willing to consider an immediate increase of 5% (on the cost of living index principle) as an interim measure pending the opening of discussions for arriving at a new method of adjusting pilots' earnings, including (as we have most strenuously emphasized) the necessity of recognising what we, in turn, might call pilots' fringe benefits, to be derived, for example, from a surcharge on rates for weekend and Bank Holiday work and so on. I must here at once add that the discussions were between officials, and we must await the decision of the Chamber's Pilotage Committee for any formal proposals. It is for this reason that I am making this communication "confidential".



Secretary's Report

We of course contend, as I hope you fully appreciate, that we are not in present circumstances bound in any way by the decisions of the late Sir Robert Letch and the former Minister. We claim that pilots are not interested in the reasons which have prompted the Owners to increase remuneration, or, for that matter, why it is divided up into sub-headings to which various labels are attached. It is the end product only with which we are concerned, namely, the consolidated basic rate. They do not agree.

Assuming that the formal letter from the Chamber makes some such offer as is outlined above, we have to consider what course we ought to take. The immediate and natural reaction is to refuse it. If that were done, what is to be the next step? The constitutional procedure would be to take a test port and submit an application to the Board of Trade for such adjustment in rates as will increase net earnings by, say 25% - being the equivalent increase in the new consolidated basic rate. I ought here to mention that the official statement of the National Maritime Board estimates that the total overall increase in cost to the industry is approximately 12%. Moreover, as responsible people we have to consider further what are the prospects of success in such a course, particularly in the light of the former decisions and the Government's present incomes policy.

The hearing of such an Inquiry before the Board of Trade would probably not take place until nearly the end of April at the earliest, and a decision some three or four weeks later. If we go ahead and win, everyone would presumably be completely satisfied. If the decision was against us we could of course immediately call for a general review of the Letch Agreement, in which the principal element would be the re-writing of the level of earnings and undoubtedly the claiming of fringe benefits for weekend etc., work as mentioned above, and an all-round improvement in working conditions, leave, pensions and so forth. Any such general review, in the light of so many adverse decisions, would clearly tend to be

uphill work and inevitably last, I would suggest, six months at least and quite possibly far longer. During this period pilots would not of course be receiving the interim adjustment which seems likely to be offered if our claim for the full equivalent adjustment to the change in consolidated basic rates were not proceeded with. In short, therefore, it amounts to this - Do pilots feel the wisest course would be to accept the 5% if it is offered and thereupon commence immediate negotiations for a revision of Clause 6(i), or would it be preferable to put forward a Section 18 application to give us the higher figure, calling for a review only if we were to fail?

I am perfectly well aware that there are those who consider that it would greatly assist if pressure were brought to bear upon the Owners by a "withdrawal of services", or other industrial action such as refusing to do weekend work until overtime payment for these duties at a satisfactory rate is fully recognised and brought into operation. If that course were contemplated, it would be for the pilots' organizations to decide at what stage or point in our negotiations it was to be brought into operation, and once again it would be necessary to do what we could to foresee the outcome and to evaluate likely results.

I must conclude by saying it is becoming more and more my experience that when, in the variety of difficult circumstances which from time to time arise, I attempt to place before pilots the various possible alternatives for their consideration, I do nothing but incur the displeasure of certain sections, most of whom seem to misconstrue what is being said and seldom, if ever, have experienced the responsibility of trying to carry their wishes into operation. I want to do the best I possibly can, but the responsibility for making policy decisions must be yours. What has been said above is solely for the purpose of assisting you in examining and considering the various alternative courses as I see them, and their relative merits and demerits. If anyone has different ideas or new suggestions of a practical nature, I can assure you they will be very

Secretary's Report

welcome and receive most careful consideration.

Enclosed is a copy of the Agenda for our meeting.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: Members of the Executive Committee  
Copies for information to:

President, U.K.P.A.

All Local Secretaries

Honorary Secretary, London Pilots' Council

National Secretary, Transport and General Workers' Union

Mr. Curthoys.

CHAMBER OF SHIPPING OF THE  
UNITED KINGDOM

30 - 32 St. Mary Axe,  
London, E.C.3.

19th March, 1965.

C. D. Griffiths, Esq., O.B.E., D.F.C.,  
General Secretary and Solicitor,  
United Kingdom Pilots' Association,  
c/o H.Q.S. Wellington,  
Victoria Embankment,  
London, W.C.2.

Dear Sir,

The adjustments to the National Maritime Board's Scales of Pay for Navigating Officers, effective from 29th March, and their bearing on the recommendations in the Letch Report, have been very carefully considered by the Chamber.

In the course of its consideration, the Chamber has naturally had regard to the fact that these adjustments represent a reconstruction and rationalisation of the pay structure of the Merchant Navy, the main ingredient being substantial compensatory payments for week-ends at sea, and that the increase in the monthly rate for navigating officers is relatively small. In fact, a comparison between the current and the future monthly rate at the point in the N.M.B. Scale taken as the agreed point in previous discussions on adjustments in pilots' earnings shows an increase from £104. 10s. 6d. to £105. 13s. 6d., that is to say, an increase of 1.1 per cent.

Shipowners recognise that an increase of this amount in the levels of pilots' earnings would not be adequate. On the other hand, so long as sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph 6 of the Letch Report remains in its present

form, they are obliged to interpret that paragraph so as to exclude, for the purpose of measuring the appropriate increase in pilots' earnings, that element of the earnings of navigating officers which represents compensation for week-ends at sea.

The result of applying the sub-paragraph on this occasion confirms the view of shipowners that the formula it contains, although regarded as appropriate by the parties when the Letch Agreement was concluded in 1957, is now quite unrealistic. This view is borne out by the fact that, on the two earlier occasions when "fringe benefits" were an element of the increase in pay of navigating officers, an independent interpretation had to be obtained, with the result that on both occasions the interpretation placed on the sub-paragraph by shipowners was upheld. Further evidence that the formula in the sub-paragraph is not working as intended is provided by the statement in Mr. Henderson's letter to Mr. Greenwood of 15th February with reference to the impending increase. As you know, in that letter Mr. Henderson forecast that the pilots' claim would be "for certainly not less than 25 per cent." which is, of course, wholly untenable.

In these circumstances and having regard to the unsatisfactory results, from the pilots' point of view, of abiding by the terms of the Letch recommendations on this occasion, the Chamber feels that the best way out of the difficulty would be for all parties to the Letch Report to agree that:-

- (a) the level of pilots' earnings should no longer be geared to a general increase or decrease in the National Maritime Board scales of pay for navigating officers; and
- (b) some other "indicator" should be substituted in sub-paragraph 6(i).

In the view of the Chamber, an appropriate indicator might well be the index of retail prices published by the Ministry of Labour.

If your Association and the Transport and General Workers' Union agree that the matter should be dealt with in this way, and the index of retail prices adopted at any rate on this occasion, it would appear that the pilots would be entitled to a 5 per cent. increase in earnings, this being the amount of the increase in the cost of living, as

Secretary's Report

measured by the index, since the level of earnings in the Letch Report were last adjusted.

The Chamber understands the desire of your Association and the Union to reach a speedy agreement in the interests of their members and it is suggested that, if the basis of assessment put forward is acceptable, discussions could take place later on the precise formula to replace that now contained in sub-paragraph 6(i) of the Report.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) L. J. H. HORNER,  
General Manager.

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

23rd March, 1965.

Dear Sir,

*1965 N.M.B. Adjustment*

Further to my circular letter of 4th March, a joint meeting of the Executive Committees of the two pilots' organizations duly took place on 22nd March, when they had before them the promised letter from the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, dated 19th March, a copy of which is enclosed.

Although in the light of the earlier informal discussions its contents did not altogether come as a surprise, it was fully recognised that the Chamber's interpretation of Clause 6(i) of the Letch Agreement whereby, in their view, the increase resulting from the current adjustment was nothing more than 1.1%, would be wholly unacceptable to the Pilotage Service as a whole. The overwhelming majority of ports, as far as can be told, also seem completely opposed to the suggestion of accepting 5%, with the conditions attached to such a step.

The Joint Executives feel that had the terms of the Letch Agreement been strictly applied since its inception, recommended earnings should, with effect from 29th March, be not less than 30% higher than the current figure and very possibly more. The precise figure at this moment does not matter. *This discrepancy arises for one reason and one reason only*, namely, a dispute between the Shipowners on the one

hand and the Pilots on the other as to the correct construction and application of Clause 6(i).

*Despite this difference of view, you must please understand that at the moment the Letch Agreement is in full force, and accordingly binding upon us all in so far as the application of the current award is concerned.* The two Committees therefore had to consider the correct course to take to resolve this very serious difference in construction. To this there can only be one immediate answer, namely, that the dispute should be submitted to arbitration in pursuance of the Arbitration Act, 1950. The Arbitrator to be appointed would not be an official of any Government Department or anyone concerned with the Shipping Industry or pilotage, but someone of repute and standing in the legal profession – probably a leading Queen's Counsel well experienced in Commercial Law.

The Committees accordingly decided to adjourn their deliberations until Tuesday next, 30th March, and meanwhile to acquaint the Chamber of their decision and to request that they let us know by that date without fail whether or not they would be agreeable to adopting this course.

If they are, action will immediately be taken to expedite the hearing so that the earliest possible decision can be arrived at. Should the Arbitrator's award go against the pilots, then a general review of the Letch Agreement would immediately be called for in order, amongst other things, to settle a new scale of recommended earnings and the method for future increases. Naturally it would be the intention in any such review to deal with a number of other matters of vital importance to the working conditions of pilots. Should the Arbitrator's award support the pilots' contention, then clearly the Shipowners would call for a general review, as it is understood that, whilst of course having to comply with his award, they would not for the future be prepared to use the National Maritime Board scales of pay as the yardstick in connexion with variations in pilots' earnings.

Finally, if the Chamber of Shipping decline to accept the pilots' proposals for independent arbitration, then clearly the Joint Executives will be left with no alter-

Secretary's Report

native other than to recommend suitable action designed to achieve what are considered to be the legitimate rights of all pilots, for which purpose it may well become necessary to hold a series of regional meetings. About this a further communication will be sent to all ports if necessary.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: Transport and General Workers'

Union Mailing List

U.K.P.A. Local Secretaries

Copies for information to :-

President, U.K.P.A.

Honorary Secretary, London Pilots'  
Council.

Executive Committee

Mr. Curthoys.

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

7th April, 1965.

Dear Local Secretary,

*1965 N.M.B. Adjustment*

Mr. Tate and I fully appreciate the natural anxiety of every pilot in the present situation to be told as quickly as possible the progress of events, and just what is or is not happening. I will do my utmost to comply, but I must ask you to have confidence in your Executive and to understand that it is not possible to keep you informed of every single move. May I assure you that each step which is being taken is as a result of joint meetings of the Executives of the two pilots' organizations, and on the most recent occasion, namely, Monday last, this was preceded by a meeting in London of the London Pilots' Council.

My last letter to all ports dated 23rd March gave you the position up to that date. Since then there has been a further meeting of the Joint Executives on 30th March, as a consequence of which Mr. O'Leary and I visited the Chamber of Shipping on 5th April, and this was followed by another joint meeting of the two Executives which lasted until late in the evening.

Further close investigation of the steps towards reconstructing and rationalising the

Merchant Navy pay structure has left no doubt that the suggestion that there has been an *overall* increase of something like 25% is completely illusory – the real increase is approximately 12%. The Shipowners have intimated a willingness (a) for an immediate increase of 5%; (b) for the recognition of a five day week (with a consequential addition in the "proper" number of pilots and rate adjustment to provide for that additional number the new Letch mean level); and (c) following discussions which Mr. O'Leary and I had with them earlier this week they are now prepared to consider the possibility of recognising pilots' fringe benefits in the form of a special further increase for the value of weekend working, to be assessed as an overall percentage adjustment on a national basis. This latter vital point is the one about which we are negotiating at the moment, and both Executives agree that this offers a far more hopeful line to pursue than enforcing arbitration.

Enclosed with this letter is a questionnaire about weekend work, the answers to which I shall be glad to receive as soon as possible to enable Mr. O'Leary and me to continue our talks, about the urgency of which I am glad to say the Chamber of Shipping are now in no doubt whatsoever.

It is anticipated that the formal confirmation of the Chamber to proceed along these lines will be received in about a week, in which event an appropriate letter will be sent to the Board of Trade agreeing to an immediate 5% adjustment. This rate increase can be combined with such further adjustment as may be needed to provide the necessary revenue for the additional number of pilots (without waiting for them to be actually licensed), and there will subsequently be yet a further increase when we reach a satisfactory settlement on the value of weekend and Bank Holiday services etc.

Yours truly,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: All Local Secretaries  
President, U.K.P.A.  
Executive Committee  
London Pilots' Council  
Mr. Curthoys

for information.

Secretary's Report

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION  
Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

TRANSPORT AND GENERAL  
WORKERS' UNION  
Transport House,  
Smith Square,  
London, S.W.1.

26th April, 1965.

1965 N.M.B. Adjustment  
Progress Note

The question of the pilots' claim for compensation in respect of week-end duties will be further considered by the Pilotage Committee of the Chamber of Shipping on Wednesday next, 28th April, and by the full Council of the Chamber on Thursday, 29th April. Following this the Sub-Committee of the Joint Executives have been invited to attend a top level meeting at the Chamber on Friday, 30th April.

In view of the nature of the issues involved on this occasion, a satisfactory solution may not be arrived at speedily. The Joint Executives will, however, be kept posted as to developments.

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS,  
General Secretary and

(Signed) T. O'LEARY,  
National Secretary,  
Docks Group.

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.  
13th May, 1965.

Dear Member,

1965 N.M.B. Adjustment

When the Joint Sub-Committee met representatives of the Chamber on 30th April, we were informed that they had been unable to obtain permission from their principals to discuss with us the possibility of any weighting in earnings in respect of weekend services. As this was an indispensable element in the negotiations as they then stood, we were obliged to make an entirely fresh start and it was agreed that

for that purpose we should keep strictly to the terms of the Letch Agreement, including the operation of Clause 6(i). The proposed increase put forward by the Chamber at that meeting was not acceptable to us, and, as you were informed in the circular of 1st May, the meeting was adjourned until yesterday, 12th May.

I am pleased to say that at yesterday's meeting, after prolonged and difficult bargaining, the Chamber ultimately came out with a final offer of 12%. This is in fact the total net actual increase in the scale of pay resulting from the latest N.M.B. Adjustment, for the appropriate Merchant Service Officer and both Union and U.K.P.A. representatives on the Sub-Committee strongly recommend its acceptance.

In the course of our deliberations we were able to extract formally from the Shipowners that, at any rate for the past two years or so, they had recognised that manning arrangements in each District could properly be made on the basis that every pilot was entitled to 100 days per annum free of all obligations for duty, and that in accordance with Clause 3 of the Letch Report no objection would be taken to any rate adjustment necessary to provide the current net recommended level of earnings for the proper number of pilots arrived at on that basis.

In order to bring conditions in the Pilotage Service still further into line with the seafaring community, the Shipowners are now prepared to recognise a five-day week - that is to say 126 days per annum (instead of the former 100 days) free of duty - but if more pilots are required in respect of this additional 26 days' leave no further rate increase would be called for, as this is of course included in the 12%.

Will you kindly let me know by return of post whether, as a member of the Executive Committee, you agree to accept the Chamber's proposals. As soon as the decision of the Executives of the two pilots' organizations has been received, we will approach the Chamber with a view to the usual letter being sent to the Board of Trade.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: The Members of the U.K.P.A.  
Executive Committee.

Secretary's Report

(B) Copy correspondence covering the question of free time, manning arrangements, and rate adjustments attributable to the licensing of additional pilots.

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION  
Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.  
21st May, 1965.

Dear Local Secretary,

1965 N.M.B. Adjustment

I am now able to let you know formally that agreement has been reached between the shipowners and the pilots' organizations that for the purpose of giving effect to Clause 6(i) of the Letch Report, current recommended levels of earnings should be increased by 12%. In accordance with the usual practice the Board of Trade will be requested to inform Pilotage Authorities that in all appropriate cases such adjustment should be made in rates as will increase by 12% that proportion of gross pilotage which is attributable to pilots' earnings and pension contributions, irrespective of where net earnings for the calendar year 1964 were within the agreed tolerance.

You already know that, because of the wide differences which originally divided us, consideration had to be given to finding a solution along a number of alternative lines. In the end it was not found possible to arrive at a satisfactory answer by any of those means, and accordingly it was decided to keep to the Letch Agreement both as regards the present adjustment and to retain it for future use unless and until either side called for a general review or its provisions were modified by mutual agreement.

The settlement now reached includes one new feature namely, the agreement of the Chamber of Shipping to accept a reduction in the working week for pilots from 5½ days to 5 days (or from 44 hours to 40 hours), thus giving pilots a total of 126 days per annum free of all obligations for

duty instead of the existing 100 days, which they formally confirmed they fully recognised as being their present entitlement.

This leave is arrived at (in round figures) as follows:-

	5-day week	5½-day week
Saturdays ...	52	26
Sundays ...	52	52
Bank Holidays (including New Year's Day) ...	7	6
Annual Leave ...	21	21
	132	105
Less weekends during annual leave ...	6	5
	126	100

No allowance has been made for average absence due to sickness, administrative duties etc., and this will have to wait another day. We just cannot get everything at once.

You will be aware that Clause 3 of Letch provides that it is a basic condition of the recommendations as to earnings that the number of pilots shall be the proper number, and furthermore that rates should be fixed and adjusted as occasion requires to produce for that number the level of net earnings recommended. Ports are therefore entitled to the new increased recommended level of earnings for the proper number of pilots calculated on every pilot being entitled to 100 days per annum free of all obligations for duty. Many ports are already manned on this basis, but if any are not it is up to them to do so and to seek such consequential increase in rates as is necessary to provide the agreed earnings for the additional number of pilots.

No rate increase can be called for if it was desired to license further pilots for the sole purpose of enjoying additional leave beyond 100 days and up to 126 days, as that is included in the 12% increase.

It proved impossible to obtain authority to discuss any claim for a surcharge in respect of weekend services, and this question was therefore entirely ignored and

Secretary's Report

forms no part whatsoever of the present settlement.

I hope everyone will clearly understand the position, and will be able to appreciate the difficulties we have experienced and the reasons why it has taken some time to conclude our negotiations.

As soon as I know that the letter from the Chamber of Shipping has been dispatched to the Board of Trade, I will write to your Authority making formal application for a rate adjustment on your behalf, although no doubt you will in addition be making an immediate direct approach locally.

In conclusion, I want to say this. Strong as our differences at times have been, the Chairman of the Chamber's Pilotage Committee, who presided at our meetings, was scrupulously fair throughout and on more than one occasion confirmed important points in favour of the pilots. With the additional free time now officially recognised, your Sub-Committee certainly holds the view that it is the duty of all pilots to take a careful look at their present working systems to ensure that the most efficient and economical use is being made of existing man-power during their on-duty periods, and be willing to accept changes where these may be considered desirable.

Yours truly,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: All Local Secretaries  
President, U.K.P.A.  
Executive Committee  
Honorary Secretary, London  
Pilots' Council  
Mr. Curthoys  
for information.

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.  
6th July, 1965.

Dear Sir,

*Earnings of Pilots*

By now the great majority of ports covered by the recommendations of the Committee under the chairmanship of the late Sir Robert Letch on the earnings of pilots (and quite a number of those which

were not) have taken the necessary action as regards pilotage rates in their District to give effect to the adjustment in the N.M.B. scales of pay which came into effect in March of this year.

2. In one or two instances, however, this Association has been approached because misunderstanding seems to have arisen at Authority level on their pilots' claim to be manned on the basis that they are each entitled to not less than 100 days per annum free of all obligations for duty, and if they are not that numbers should be appropriately increased and rates immediately adjusted to produce the current mean recommended level of earnings for the new total number of pilots.

3. Some Authorities have claimed that this forms no part of the present agreement. This in one sense is true because there is nothing new in it. It has been accepted by the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom for many years, and if in certain Districts no effect has been given to it that is an omission which clearly calls for urgent attention. All members of this Association have been informed of their entitlement and should long ago have approached their Authority where appropriate and acquainted them of their claim. The Letch Agreement, as you will be aware, specifically states (in Clause 3) that it was a basic condition of the recommendations that the number of pilots should in fact be the proper number, and that rates should be fixed (and adjusted as occasion requires) to produce for that number the level of earnings recommended. In arriving at the proper number of pilots it is essential to recognise that the available strength of the Service will be reduced by the absence of each pilot during 100 days in each year when on leave free from any obligation for duty, in addition to the reduction in the available number of pilots by the absence of those who may be sick, engaged on administrative duties, over-carried, etc.

4. Therefore, quite outside the question of a rate adjustment in pursuance of any other clause, if numbers are increased then, subject to what is said in Paragraph 6 below, rates should be adjusted to provide for the new proper number the prevailing mean recommended level. If additional pilots are required because of an improvement in

Secretary's Report

trade, it may of course well be that the additional traffic will itself provide sufficient increased revenue without the necessity of a rate adjustment as well.

5. The reason for the question of 100 free days being mentioned at all on this occasion was that the Chamber of Shipping very fairly agreed, for the purpose of bringing conditions in the Pilotage Service more into line with those at sea, to recognise a reduction in the working week from 5½ days to 5 days (or from 44 hours to 40 hours). By way of illustration, there is set out below a comparison (in round figures) of the former with the new position as to free time, viz. :-

	5½-day week	5-day week
Saturdays ...	26	52
Sundays ...	52	52
Bank Holidays		
including New		
Year's Day) ...	6	7
Annual Leave ...	21	21
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	105	132
Less weekends during		
annual leave ...	5	6
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	126
	<hr/>	<hr/>

6. It was, however, understood and accepted that if any further pilots were to be licensed to provide leave beyond 100 days and up to 126 days, there should be no compensatory rate increase as this was included in the 12% recommended figure. Furthermore, it was inherent in these arrangements (and in the national appeal for greater productivity) that the Pilotage Service at every port should in any event be prepared to examine its working system to ensure that in every possible way the most efficient and economical use was being made of the manpower available for duty. This Association feels confident that at those ports where leave and free time does not yet come up to present day accepted standards, the co-operation of the pilots in maintaining efficiency and avoiding unnecessary expense in any arrangements designed to bring this about will be readily forthcoming.

7. In the light of this explanation it is hoped that all Authorities who have not

yet done so will examine the conditions of work and amount of leave at their port, and where necessary make appropriate adjustments as indicated above. It is hoped that this will not be allowed to hold up the implementation of the current N.M.B. Adjustment, and it should, if necessary, be made the subject matter of a subsequent alteration in the Schedule of Dues.

8. A copy of this letter is being sent to the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, to whom no doubt you may wish to refer should clarification or confirmation of any points be required.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: All Pilotage Authorities  
(Where there is U.K.P.A. membership)

Copy to the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom (for information).

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.  
7th July, 1965.

Dear Local Secretary,

*1965 N.M.B. Adjustment*

*Leave and the Proper Number of Pilots*  
Enclosed is a copy of a letter which has been sent to all Pilotage Authorities at Districts where this Association has members, and which I trust is clear and self-explanatory.

At those ports where a claim can properly be made for a reduction in work index and consequential increase in numbers, it is not suggested that negotiations for that purpose should be allowed to hold up the application of the recent 12% award, otherwise the delay could obviously be protracted. Once the N.M.B. adjustment is in operation - and at a number of ports it already is - the question as to the right to additional pilots can then be investigated and the action indicated in my letter taken wherever necessary.

At the same time the Executive Committee feels it only right to point out that it is the clear duty of every member port to examine existing leave and working systems

Secretary's Report

(some of which may well have been introduced when conditions were very different from what they are to-day) in order to ensure that the best use is being made of existing manpower. If claims for additional pilots are to be justified – and no one doubts that in certain instances they are long overdue – the port in question must obviously be prepared, if their contention is challenged, to submit their administrative arrangements and routine method of work to a fair and impartial scrutiny, if need be by work study experts. It is readily accepted that pilots render an invaluable service to shipowners and can undoubtedly play a very full part in contributing towards the prosperity of the industry, and the general economic well-being of the country as a whole. Presumably no one would disagree that it would be very wrong if costs were to be kept at an unnecessarily high level because of traditional but out-dated systems of work which resulted in the need for maintaining far more pilots than the trade of the port really justified.

In passing on these views I hasten to add that the Executive by no means considers that improvement in efficiency, with the resultant economies, is an exclusively one-sided affair. A substantial contribution, long overdue, should also be made both by shipowners and Authorities, Guaranteed E.T.A.s, more up-to-date methods of communication and travel, and fuller use of radar (to mention only a few), could each contribute greatly towards the reduction and possible elimination of the tedious, but in present circumstances unavoidable, dead time taken up by watchkeeping, antiquated travel arrangements and cruising on sea stations. These are important policy matters about which the Executive would welcome the opinion of delegates at this year's Conference, so that they can be taken up with the parties concerned.

Yours truly,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

To: All Local Secretaries  
President  
Executive Committee  
Mr. Curthoys  
for information.

**APPENDIX III**

Copy correspondence regarding the standard of manning and equipment in bulk carriers.

UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

12th January, 1965.

Dear Sir,

I have been requested by the Executive Committee of this Association to bring to the notice of the Chamber for such action as they consider suitable and possible the terms of the following resolution adopted at its Annual Conference in October last, namely:—

“That this Association deplores the inadequacies in manning and of basic equipment which are evident in the larger classes of tanker and bulk carrier in general service.”

It is, of course, appreciated that the advent of the very large bulk carrier has produced a wide variety of problems, some of which are quite outside the concern of those whose task it is to handle and manoeuvre them in restricted waters and complete their safe berthing. Furthermore, it is recognised that in a number of the larger vessels, particularly those in British ownership, additional aids for their safety have been introduced in recent years.

Despite this it is still felt that certain difficulties of common experience are capable of being remedied relatively simply, and others of a more complex nature might well receive further early consideration. Amongst those appearing to lend themselves to immediate action are the supply of more adequate crew for mooring and unmooring, and more particularly when making fast, say, as many as four or more tugs when there is a relatively short run to the berth. Another is the provision of V.H.F. equipment (with appropriate channels) on the bridge, with long leads or plug-in points to enable the pilot to give directions to the tugs from the wings during the actual operation of berthing. It will be unnecessary

Secretary's Report

to point out that vessels of the kind referred to in the resolution require very skilled handling, which necessitates immediate compliance with orders and, in particular, complete co-operation and understanding between all concerned in the operation. It has surprised a number of pilots that so elementary a requirement as V.H.F. communication is not always available, and from the bridge wings hardly at all. In addition to the danger to other shipping, its absence sooner or later will inevitably result (for example during a dark tide or in difficult weather conditions) in a ship being put to anchor which otherwise might have been safely berthed – a step which every pilot is most anxious to avoid. Information prominently displayed in a suitable position on the bridge as to engine power ahead and percentage power astern would also be of very great assistance.

Amongst the longer term matters about which my Committee would appreciate an opportunity of putting forward suggestions are the position and design of the bridge, greater astern power, twin screws and twin rudders in vessels over certain dimensions, and the provision of athwartship propulsion.

This Association would be grateful to receive any views the Chamber might care to express on dealing with the points raised in this letter, and in particular would appreciate knowing whether the possibility of one or two senior and experienced pilots being invited to serve on any committee which may exist to advise on these difficulties might be considered helpful. I am to say in conclusion that the primary concern of my Executive Committee in making this approach is to ensure the greatest possible efficiency in the services which pilots render, and to increase the safety and certainty with which their operations can be carried out under all conditions of weather.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

The Secretary,  
Chamber of Shipping of the United  
Kingdom,  
30/32 St. Mary Axe,  
London, E.C.3.

CHAMBER OF SHIPPING OF THE  
UNITED KINGDOM

30/32 St. Mary Axe,  
London, E.C.3.  
24th May, 1965.

C. D. Griffiths, Esq., O.B.E., D.F.C.  
General Secretary and Solicitor,  
United Kingdom Pilots' Association,  
Shannon Court, Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.

Dear Sir,

The Chamber would refer further to your letter dated 12th January and subsequent correspondence concerning the resolution adopted at your Association's Annual Conference in October 1964 which deplored “... the inadequacies in manning and of basic equipment which are evident in the larger classes of tanker and bulk carrier in general service.”

Although the Chamber must refute any suggestion that British ships of this class are undermanned, it has to be pointed out that matters relating to ships' personnel are the responsibility of the Shipping Federation Limited and not the Chamber of Shipping. The Chamber is however authorised by the Federation to state that the deck manning of British foreign-going vessels was the subject of detailed discussions between the Board of Trade, the Federation, the Employer's Association of the Port of Liverpool, and the Seafarers' Organizations in the autumn of last year. During these discussions it was emphasized and accepted that in considering deck manning from the point of view of safety, regard must be paid to safety in mooring and unmooring operations. The wording of the resolution is imprecise in its reference to “larger classes” and presumably the reference is to vessels of all nationalities. If, however, a specific case or cases involving a U.K. registered vessel can be quoted, the Federation would certainly be prepared to go into the matter with the owners concerned.

With regard to the technical aspects of the mooring of ships, this is a subject which has been given close attention by the industry and indeed as part of the industry's collective research work in which the seafarers' organizations have participated, the Chamber has recently put in hand a comprehensive study of mooring methods. This

Secretary's Report

study which is expected to take about two years is being undertaken by a team specially contracted by the Chamber for this purpose who will be conducting an extensive series of investigations on board merchant ships, during which no doubt they will have the opportunity of discussing the situation with pilots. This study has two basic aims: firstly, to establish codes of existing best practice for different classes of ship and secondly, to recommend what further improvements in mooring equipment are required in order to obtain full efficiency. The Chamber believes that this study, which will cover a wide range of ships and berthing conditions, will make a valuable contribution to establishing the relative efficiency of different mooring systems.

The provision of V.H.F. equipment is also a subject which has for some time engaged the attention of the Chamber's Radio Advisory Service. The R.A.S. has given publicity to the use of this equipment and although the exact number of ships fitted is not known, it is understood that between the end of 1960 and 1964 the percentage of ships passing the Nore fitted with V.H.F. increased from 20% to 65%. It is believed that in the U.K. the great majority of owners have fitted their ships with V.H.F. or are doing so.

The study of mooring is a good example of the active interest which owners are currently taking in technical research. Many individual owners already themselves undertake considerable research investigations, but over the last three years a Research Committee established by the Chamber has been reviewing the whole field of ship research and determining whether there are any ways in which the research structure can be improved. As a result of this work the Chamber has achieved a closer and more effective liaison with many research organizations and has also, through its Research Department, implemented a number of studies on behalf of the industry. Through such bodies as the British Ship Research Association, a number of those items to which you refer in the latter part of your letter are already being closely studied, and the aim of all the work is to ensure that by achieving the maximum co-operation between all those concerned with ship design and con-

struction, research is concentrated on those items of most benefit to the industry as a whole.

It is regretted that pressure of business has delayed the earlier dispatch of a considered reply to your letter. The Chamber fully appreciates your Association's concern to ensure the greatest possible efficiency in the service which pilots render and should you wish to submit to the Chamber further details of the points mentioned briefly in your letter, you may be assured that the Chamber will consider very carefully how advantage can best be taken of the advice of your members.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) L. WATSON.

Assistant General Manager.  
UNITED KINGDOM PILOTS'  
ASSOCIATION

Shannon Court,  
Corn Street,  
Bristol, 1.  
1st June, 1965.

Dear Sir,

I much appreciated receiving your very detailed letter of 24th May, which I will be placing before my Executive Committee at its meeting in July next, after which a considered reply will be sent.

Meanwhile, I know I can assure you that this Association will be very pleased to afford the maximum possible co-operation in the investigations at present being carried out as to mooring methods, and all other forms of technical research designed to improve efficiency and safety when handling ships, particularly in restricted waters. It is greatly hoped that both the Chamber and the Shipping Federation Limited will display a readiness to take pilots into consultation regarding these matters and the researches which are going on, as it is felt with respect that they have an important - perhaps indispensable - contribution to make, and they would greatly welcome being afforded an opportunity of doing so.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) C. D. GRIFFITHS.

The Assistant General Manager,  
Chamber of Shipping of the United  
Kingdom,  
30/32 St. Mary Axe,  
London, E.C.3.

## THE REPORT DISCUSSED

**Mr. John Edmondson**

On behalf of the London District pilots I would like to thank Mr. Griffiths for his report and the many facets of our problems which he covers therein, and I would commend his wisdom in including with his report the important correspondence which passed at the time of the battle to increase the pilotage rates so that all those who were not in the immediate fore-front of the struggle and who were unaware of the many tedious steps that had to be taken can now read those letters for themselves.

Generally, we in the London District accept this report as correct, but we are left wondering, now that there has been a substantial change in the structure of the Merchant Navy officers' pay scales, whether it would not be wise to consider a general review of our traditional methods of payment - such as the draught and tonnage system which, while it is a "rate for the job" system, is, perhaps, not the way of payment for professional men. However, I must emphasise that this is purely a thought for discussion in the future and by no means a wish of the London District at this time.

The Secretary refers to the advisability of employing a Public Relations Officer. This to us, seems a good idea, not only to keep our own members aware of what the Executive is doing on behalf of all, but, also to defend the name and standing of the pilots' profession generally and to present a proper image to the public. - I would mention a recent article in the *Sunday Times* which referred to the pilots of one particular station in terms which can only be described as scurrilous. - A Public Relations Officer would have been able to consult with the station so treated and take the best means of refuting those allegations.

Productivity is an idea on the agenda for later discussion at this conference, but I think we should all be very grateful to Mr. Griffiths for the letter he has written to the Pilotage Authorities clarifying the matter of 100 and 126 days clear of duty and no Authority can now be in any doubt about this important matter. Productivity is being urged not only on the pilot services but on the whole nation and I am sure that our

Executive will accept this as an all-station problem, because, if they don't, fragmentation will result with advances on some stations while others stand still. In the London District the London Pilots' Council has set up a sub-committee to investigate this subject.

**"Biggest Single Break-through we have ever had"**

The matter of pensions is, also, to be discussed at this Conference and I will only say that we regard what has already been made known to us as the biggest single break-through that we have ever had. We gladly accept what has already been released and we deplore most strongly the obstruction that has been placed in the way of a national pensions scheme by certain important ports. We feel that the national pensions scheme is like being presented with a double-headed penny to toss and no-one can lose. Those stations which are fortunate in having satisfactory pensions schemes are not going to be forced to join and subsidise the scheme for the less fortunate, while those who do not yet enjoy a satisfactory scheme now have the basic plans of one to hand.

**Thanks to Mr. Balmain**

The Merchant Shipping (Pilot Ladders), Rules, 1965, came into operation in May and we are pleased that there has been this step in the right direction and our sincere thanks are due to Mr. Balmain for the hard work that he has put in on this particular subject. There is however, still some way to go and we cannot afford to relax our vigilance. Mr. Griffiths is, at present, dealing with the claim of a Cinque Ports pilot who, some 10 weeks ago, when stepping down into a British ship in the darkness was pitched headlong into the ship as the whole apparatus came adrift. As a result he was unable to work for six weeks. The pilot concerned is the next man on the roster after me and it is an incident such as this, almost on one's own doorstep, that makes one very conscious of the need for improving still further the regulations concerning pilot ladders and here I suggest that we might emulate Australia.

Our rules run to some 14 pages - theirs

to one. Ours on Page 1 exempt from the rules the vessels of more than twenty nations. Pages two differentiates between vessels of Class 1 which are passenger steamers engaged on voyages (not being short international voyages), any of which are long international voyages and vessels of Class 2 which are passenger steamers engaged on voyages (not being long international voyages), any of which are short international voyages – and so on, Page 3 enlightens us and tells us that a voyage means an excursion and that a long international voyage means an international voyage which is not a short international voyage, while the word "sea" does not include any partially smooth waters and "smooth waters" does not include the sea.

Then we get eleven brief paragraphs – less than a page – relating to the construction of the ladder, followed by ten pages of the schedule defining the limits of smooth and partially smooth water areas. The Australian rules, on the other hand, start by saying: "The master of every ship requiring the services of a pilot shall comply with the following requirements" – No reservations, no qualifications or classifications of ships, just every ship. The physical aspects of the ladder are virtually the same as those required by our rules, but they are rounded off by two and a half lines. "For any breach of this regulation, on or by any ship, the master of that ship shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £100." – a salutary addition which tends to lead to a diligent observation of the regulations.

On the subject of unification of the pilots' organizations, although over 850 members of this Association were in favour of one organization, over half the members voted against unification with the pilots of the Transport & General Workers' Union under the proposed terms, and we now look to the Executive for any suggestions they may have to make.

#### Regional Councils ?

We would like to thank Mr. Griffiths for his efforts on our behalf as the Pilots' Ombudsman. However, we do wonder if it would ease his load if Regional Councils were formed within our Association, say about five; Scotland, the North-west and Northern Ireland, the North-east, the South-west and the South-east. The Regional

Councils thus formed could then, in the proposed manner of M.P.'s and the national Ombudsman, do much of the donkey work in these matters with guidance from and ultimate reference to the Secretary. Possibly a sub-committee of the Executive could consider this matter in detail and report back to us at next year's Conference.

Generally, in the last part of his report, the Secretary refers to the representation of pilots on the various local bodies responsible for the operation of the docks. This was, I recall, mentioned at last year's Conference and we trust that eventually, through constant pressure, we shall be accepted on those committees. May I remind you of the constituents of the National Ports Council under the Chairmanship of Viscount Rochdale. They are :

- A former adviser to the Minister on shipping in ports;
- A Director of the National Association of Port Employers;
- A former Chairman of the British Waterways Board;
- A joint Chairman of the British Shippers' Council;
- A former Chairman of the Liverpool Steamship Owners' Association;
- The Chairman of the National Bank of Scotland;
- The National Secretary of the docks group of the Transport and General Workers' Union;
- A past President of the Chamber of Shipping;
- The General Secretary of the Amalgamated Weavers' Association who is a member of the T.U.C. General Council.

All excellent men I am sure – but from the profession concerned with getting ships in and out of those ports, no one, and, I am sure, it would be of little satisfaction to us, should the Government set up a council to investigate the textile industry, if a member of our Executive was appointed to that committee.

On the matter of helicopters, as a result of inquiries we have made, we believe that the cost of a general use of helicopters for shipping and landing pilots would, at the present time, be prohibitive, but that, possibly, the use of hydro-foils and hovercraft would bear further investigation.

Finally, I would again congratulate the Secretary on his report and again urge its acceptance by this Conference.

#### Mr. D. McMillan

The Secretary's report on the proper number of pilots and increased productivity has been read by my station with very great interest. Could we suggest that a copy be sent to our Licensing Authority or to the very much misnamed Ruler of Pilots at Gravesend. It would no doubt save a great deal of wasted effort on our part and fewer frayed tempers as they are still living in 1932. One begins to wonder whether this is 1965 when pilots are told :-

- (1) A seafarer is expected to work 365 days of the year.
- (2) Every pilot must do the same work quota whether he is 35 or 65. If he can't he shouldn't be here.
- (3) If you River pilots don't want to work there are plenty of watermen and tugmasters to do your job.

We have been endeavouring for five years to reduce our work index to a more logical figure. We cannot take a 100 days free of all liability from duty without our station collapsing, but how can you combat stupidity, inefficiency and incompetence of the ruling body and no pilot deliberately refuses to work? We have a simple system. When a pilot is absent he is marked absent in the duty book; when no reply is obtainable from his house we mark, "no reply". Those to any logical man would be sufficient, yet we get letters written asking "Why were you absent, why was there no reply!"

Our senior men are being dunned by the Licensing Authority to explain why they have not performed the same number of acts of pilotage as the younger pilots.

Our station has so little confidence in its Authority that we have had to employ a lawyer to present the facts because we have been fobbed off too many times by officialdom and red tape.

We have stated our willingness to submit to a Ministry Inquiry as did the Humber three years ago, but the five days a week "hardworking" officials consider they can force us to have their type of inquiry. We are going to require assistance from the U.K.P.A. to ensure that our inquiry is impartial and unbiased and we hope that our

President will assist us because we're quite prepared to perform sixty minutes' honest work for every hour's pay. Our record is second to none, but tired and disheartened pilots are bad pilots and the River pilots are at present very tired and very disheartened.

In further discussion of the Report Messrs. Perry, Berry, Coates and Knowles took part and some points were further explained by Mr. Griffiths, particularly in relation to the free time to which pilots were entitled.

Mr. Coates referred to the good company they were keeping in being in E.M.P.A. whose annual meeting he attended as an observer.

Mr. Griffiths also mentioned that membership of the U.K.P.A. did not entitle pilots to the services of the solicitor for their personal problems, but in other cases where the services of a local solicitor was sought he asked to be kept in the picture so that if anything went wrong he could deal with it.

#### CMDR. RADFORD'S BOOK

Commander John Radford in a letter to the Editor of *The Pilot* says he has rewritten the Pilotage Information Section in Brown's *Nautical Almanack*. It is now so arranged that all the ports are in alphabetical order and he asks that any pilot wishing to make comment or suggestions for alterations or improvement, additions or deletions should do so to him directly or to the Editor of the Almanack. Pilots wishing to have such information in the 1967 edition are requested to write promptly to him as it goes to press in May. His address is, Leaholme, Appley Road, Ryde, Isle of Wight.

Commander Radford who is the Senior Inward Pilot, Isle of Wight Pilotage District and also one of the Sub-Commissioners has written a book "Pilot Aboard" which is being published by Blackwoods. He is selected pilot for the Cunard Line and Shaw, Savill & Albion Line.

"There are many highlights in this most capably written book" announce the publishers, "shipwreck, strandings, torpedoing and storms; and the capture of a spy who tried to kill Churchill."

In it he shows how a Trinity House pilot is trained, selected and employed.

## CHOICE PILOTAGE SYSTEM

Immediately after the discussion on the Report, Conference dealt with the two resolutions on the agenda. The first of these was :-

**That this Association deplores the continuation of the choice pilotage system, as being outdated and not in the best interests of the Pilotage Service generally.**

It was moved by P. A. Levack, seconded by N. P. Macfarlane and adopted, only six hands being raised against it.

### P. A. Levack

Resolutions on this subject have not been hardy annuals, but because they haven't cropped up in this form, it would be wrong to suggest that all is well in any service where it exists. It is 81 years since this Association first had a resolution on this matter. That, was at the first Conference ever held by this United Kingdom Pilots' Association. It was in Bristol in 1884. The resolution was as follows :

"That this conference of pilots deplores the evils connected with the choice pilots constantly employed on ships on every voyage, to the great detriment of sea going pilots of this country."

Maritime progress since that time has been formidable in nearly every aspect. This is true of pilotage also, except where choice pilotage is concerned. Before this old resolution is taken out of context, I must make it quite clear that some of my friends are choice pilots, indeed, the ship-owners retaining them are very fortunate. I think their professional ability and integrity is second to none. They all agree that this system leaves a lot to be desired and that the pilot service would be a better place without it.

### Trivial but it irritates

Little progress has been made in all these years to erase this blot on the turn pilots' professional ability. Too often we hear of the shipowner regarding his choice pilot as a super pilot. In fact some of them seem to think that they are super pilots. This is all very trivial and hardly bears mention, but it does irritate and can lead to dissension.

The enormous disparity in earnings has been curbed to some extent by pooling or

sharing. This disparity has not been removed by any means and has recently appeared in a new and vicious form. Enormous retainers paid by a large oil company to its choice pilots, in order to achieve its own ends, are a fairly new departure. One of the results was that London sea pilots were threatened with having a large part of their livelihood taken away and placed in the hands of serving company officers. It is a sad reflection on owners, Authorities and pilots when we allow the opportunists among us to threaten our profession and the safety of our ports and their approaches. We are only tiny cogs in the whole national scene, but I respectfully suggest that we are extremely vital ones. Practically all this country's imports and exports are assisted on their way by the work that we do. It can only be in the national interest that pilotage in the United Kingdom is efficient and healthy. This will never be so long as pilots live under the threats they have recently experienced in London and as long as this archaic relic of the past - choice pilotage - remains. It could never have survived in any other industry.

Quite apart from the dissatisfaction it causes and the resulting unhealthy morale of all services where it exists, I am firmly convinced that we can increase our efficiency if it is abandoned. It will only cease when shipowners are convinced that it is not in their best interests. I hope that steps along these lines can be taken by this Association in the very near future. Don't look for help from Pilotage Authorities - progress and the well being of pilots appears to be a subject beyond their ken.

Another ironical aspect of this ridiculous state of affairs is that shipowners supporting choice pilotage in many cases are prepared

to pay their pilots retainers which are considerably in excess of the turn pilots' money for piloting their own ships, and yet are in a position to deny all others the rates or remuneration for piloting ships under a different flag, even though they may be considerably more valuable.

### "Outdated Practices"

Why is it that in this highly competitive industry British ports seem to be about the last to cling to such outdated practices? It is practically unknown in other European and world ports. Hamburg's efficiency is well known, and is the only port geographically comparable with London. They have no choice pilots. Antwerp has no choice sea or river pilots. Rotterdam has only one and his income is the same as that of the rest. In the whole of France only two ports allow them. Le Havre has eight (two to each of four companies) Bordeaux has only three sea and twelve river pilots - all of whom are severely restricted as to size and income. It is their intention to stop this eventually.

I'm well aware that if this resolution is adopted today, little immediate change will take place on the various stations, but it will give this Association the right properly to represent all pilots as being of the same professional capacity and will remove a stigma from pilotage which has been apparent since 1884.

### N. P. Macfarlane

I don't intend to embark on a history of choice pilotage for the very good reason that, I don't know it, and wonder if anyone attending this Conference could give true origins, but it might help to illustrate the changes which have already taken place if I tell you that, on my own station, prior to the war, nearly everything was "choice". Pilots not only worked directly for the shipowner, but also for the various shipping agents. Indeed, any vessel of more than 12 feet draught could legitimately employ the services of a "choice pilot".

The war put a temporary stop on "choice work" and, when it was resumed after the war, it was agreed that vessels had to be of 6,500 tons gross and upwards to justify this service. This figure in itself was an

arbitrary one, and intended to include the Liberty type of ship, of which most companies had a fair sprinkling at that time. It must be admitted that, in its day the Liberty ship was considered a large vessel, but, as you all know, with the modern trend towards larger and more powerful ocean-going vessels, the Liberty ship is *not* a big ship by present day standards.

### Graduated Tonnage Scheme

The London pilots have been very conscious of this trend towards larger vessels, and, to ensure that pilots obtain the necessary experience, the sea stations of the London District have introduced a form of graduated tonnage. Thus before a pilot holds a first class licence, he has already had experience of piloting ships of up to 12,500 tons gross. This experience of course, is somewhat limited by the present "choice" requirements.

It is ironic to note that, under this graduated tonnage scheme, the great majority of ships now enjoying the services of a "choice" pilot, fall into the category of second class vessels, and it is also ironic to note that, with very few exceptions, the vessels which are "choice" outwards to sea, employ the services of a "turn" pilot inwards, and, although this might be a source of regret to our President, these vessels are invariably deeper when inward-bound. No doubt this is a peculiarity of our own port.

The selection of "choice" pilots on our station has a mystique of its own certainly not based on seniority, and therefore cannot be considered to be based on experience, and with mounting dislike of the system comes a reluctance of many pilots to offer themselves for this work. Under these conditions, are shipowners getting what they think they are paying for namely, "the pick of the crop"? With so many anomalies in the system, can it be wondered that we now consider it out-dated?

To implement the "choice" system calls for the operation of special bye-laws and working rules which **MUST** at times be at variance with the normal working conditions of the station. I am not now referring to abuses of these special rules by individuals, but any pilot on a station which maintains a continuous look-out, and regulated duty roster will appreciate the situation



whereby the first pilot on look-out finds himself superseded by a "choice" pilot who suddenly appears to take one of his own particular company's vessels. This not only denies the "turn" pilot a ship which he is fully qualified to handle, but rubs salt into the injury by extending the length of his look-out, and this could have a direct bearing on another item on our agenda, namely, Productivity.

One would have thought that, having examined and licensed first class pilots, the Authorities would resent the implication of the "choice" system, but this is not the case. In spite of an overwhelming vote of disapproval of the system by one section of the London Pilotage District our Authority holds the view that if this service is requested, and ONE applicant is forthcoming then the system should remain in force.

It is appreciated, and highly desirable, that pressure cannot be brought to bear on individuals, but it is hoped that, after discussion, this Conference will see fit to deplore the continuance of the "choice" system, and thereby influence its members to reject any future applications for the same.

#### D. McMillan

One must look very fairly at this resolution so as not to be biased too much on the lines of personal interests. I, myself, must consider this three ways.

- (1) As an individual pilot.
- (2) As a Compulsory River Thames pilot, and
- (3) As a London District pilot.
  - (1) As an individual it has always struck me that choice pilotage is like "Pig Farm". All pilots are equal but the selected pilot is more equal than the others!
    - (a) He has more notice of his ships arriving or sailing;
    - (b) He is usually working among friends or old acquaintances;
    - (c) Every facility is given by the company, by the tugs and by the Port Authority because he is a selected pilot; and
    - (d) His working life is easier by virtue of assistance given to get to and from the ship.

(2) As a delegate from the C.R.T. pilots and therefore representing 51 selected pilots out of 128 pilots I must say that this is a very thorny problem. Our station I consider typifies the resolution which was carried unanimously at the first Conference of the U.K.P.A. We still have choice pilots, but the main evil - applies lack of contact with the turn pilots and general lack of interest in their conditions. From the River pilots' angle the first step should be limiting the size of vessels allowed to have selected pilots. No honest pilot here to-day could justify vessels of under 1,500 gross tons or even larger being "choice" and yet we have 300, 400 and 500 ton Schuyts as selected vessels.

Likewise it would be entirely wrong to deprive pilots of selected work after many years of service, so as a River pilot I must say it is a matter of each station putting its own house in order first, but with guidance from the U.K.P.A.

(3) As a London District pilot and therefore a member of the largest block of pilots in the U.K.P.A., it is quite apparent that the pilotage service, as a whole, would benefit from the discontinuance of the choice pilot system, because every pilot would then be interested in the betterment of the pilot service. There would be no backbiting because a pilot had choice work, no special privilege and no extra money at the cost of fellow pilots.

Finally in supporting this resolution delegates must be guided by their conscience and if they have the best interest of the pilotage service in mind, they will support it, as their predecessors did in 1884, but this time let us do something about it, let the Executive find out :-

- (i) Proportion or number of selected pilots on every station.
- (ii) Type and size of vessel they pilot.
- (iii) Reasons the companies require selected pilots.

Then let the U.K.P.A. prepare a scheme slowly to reduce the number of selected pilots and in their place have a nucleus of experienced pilots to handle the big and the awkward ships similar to the plan prepared by the London District sea stations on another matter.

## REIMBURSEMENT FOR DELAYED PAY AWARDS?

**That in future biennial reviews of pilots' remuneration should be held, so that calculations can then be made to reimburse pilots at the next pay award for losses they may have sustained because of delays in the implementation of previous pay awards.**

This resolution moved by Mr. Radford on behalf of Isle of Wight (Inward) and seconded by Mr. Wylie was adopted after a very brief discussion. Mr. Radford protested that the pilots seemed to be at the end of a very long tail when awards were handed out. He said that at his station they had worked out that since 1958 due to delays in implementing pay awards every inward pilot had lost £266.

## TRINITY HOUSE APPOINTMENTS

Important changes took place at Trinity House at the beginning of the year.

Mr. ROBERT S. MCLERNON, O.B.E., T.D., the Secretary of the Corporation retired at the end of 1965 and was succeeded by Mr. SYDNEY RAWLINGS SMITH, O.B.E., M.Inst.T.

The Elder Brethren appointed Mr. EDWARD BABBS, Principal of the Pilotage Department and Mr. R. S. SOAMES, M.A., succeeded Mr. Babbs as Deputy Principal.

Preliminary announcements of these changes were made in October and at the Trinity House reception to the officers of the U.K.P.A. during Conference week and again at the Association's own reception pilots had opportunity of personally congratulating the promoted officers.

Mr. Rawlings Smith entered the Pilotage Department in 1923, was made Deputy Principal of the Department in 1936, Principal in 1948 and Assistant Secretary for Pilotage in 1960. He has been in charge of the Pilotage Department during a particu-

larly busy transitional period which has included the introduction of the London Selected Pilots Scheme, the bringing into operation of fast launches at the Isle of Wight, the alteration in conditions brought about by the Letch Report and the opening-up of Milford Haven as a major port.

He was awarded the O.B.E. in the New Year's Honours List, 1951, for his services. He was elected a Member of the Institute of Transport in 1952 and his wide knowledge of pilotage matters has been made available to many other Pilotage Authorities.

He attended The Hague International Conference on the use of V.H.F. radio-telephony at sea, in 1957, as adviser on pilotage aspects to the British Delegation.

In 1963, he was chairman of an independent committee appointed by the Guernsey States Board of Administration to consider and report on the operation and control of pilotage in Guernsey and, in 1965, he was appointed by the Board of Trade as independent chairman to examine and report on the re-organisation or amalgamation of the Cardiff, Newport and Barry pilotage services.

## "Productivity" and the Pilotage Service

### "A MAJOR NATIONAL ISSUE"

THIS was No. 5 on the Conference Agenda and it produced some very interesting speeches. Mr. M. Mitchell said he would have liked to open the batting on the subject but found himself going in about sixth. He continued:—

#### M. Mitchell

Our Secretary in his Report has dealt with the problem in a most admirable manner, and I find myself in wholehearted agreement with everything he has to say. I can only wish that it were possible for me to emulate his immaculate use of the English language.

First of all, I realise that for some reason this is a most controversial subject among pilots, it is the proverbial hot potato, and it could be that many fingers will be burned before it is settled, but nevertheless, we must make very sure that this potato never slips through those fingers.

I must emphasise that this is not the irresponsible idea of a few fanatical pilots, it is a *major national issue*, and we can ill afford to ignore this fact. It is the aim and desire of every worthwhile industry in this country today to improve efficiency, streamline methods of working, and to increase productivity, and many of us feel that we too should work to this end. Our worthy President is constantly advocating such a policy, and I am sure that he would be the first to applaud and encourage any efforts of ours along these lines.

The question now arises of how best to implement these high ideals, and of course, this must vary enormously from station to station. In my own District the possibilities seem to be endless, and all-round, will necessarily require much thought and industry to achieve the desired result. However, I am confident that given the desire, every station will find ways and means. One obvious instance in my own District shows most vividly. When piloting a ship from Gravesend to Dungeness, the last 20 miles are spent on one course through virtually open sea. Not only do we have to spend time piloting the vessel over this distance, but we also have to find casual transport home from the cutter at Dungeness, thus doubling and often trebling the time wasted.

Frequently in adverse weather conditions, low-powered ships take six or more *hours* to travel this apparently unnecessary distance. Here is one obvious opportunity to streamline the service and in itself could mean a very large increase in efficiency and saving of man-power, I assure you that there are many more instances of this sort.

It would seem that the main obstacle to overcome, will be that illusive thing known as *inertia* — which the dictionary tells me is the resistance of a body to change. This resistance will probably come from two directions, on one hand from the Pilotage Authority, and on the other from the pilots themselves. I am constantly being told by some of my elders, that this system or that system has worked perfectly well for many years, and is quite good enough for many years to come. My answer to that, is that the horse and cart worked very well for many years, but our fathers progressed to the internal combustion engine, and now we are being faced with the necessity of accepting even more sophisticated methods of propulsion, and I have no doubt that we shall do so.

At the risk of being accused of talking in clichés, I suggest that we must move with the times, keep abreast of progress and at all times our watchword must be *Productivity*.

I speak as a comparatively young pilot, but I feel convinced that the interests of the pilotage service, and indeed of the nation, will best be served only if we take a long keen look at our methods of working, and conditions of service.

#### John Edmondson

Productivity, as I said earlier, is being urged not only on to the pilotage services, but the nation as a whole and I feel sure that we are fully prepared to co-operate to this end.

We must first know, however, what is

meant by productivity, and this, the *Oxford Dictionary*, defines as "the quality or fact of being productive; the capacity of being productive", which really leaves us not a great deal wiser until we turn to the word *productive* and here we find a column of definition—"having the quality of producing or bringing forth, tending to produce, creative, generative, produces readily or abundantly, fertile, prolific" — Hardly perhaps, what Mr. George Brown had in mind for the nation or the ship-owner for the pilot, but the dictionary proceeds and eventually we find "produces or increases wealth or value engaged in the production of commodities of exchangeable value, especially in productive labour".

#### Two-sided Arrangement

But the production of commodities of exchangeable value, especially in productive labour as far as the pilotage service is concerned must be a two-sided arrangement, for the actual operation of getting a given ship from A to B cannot be done any more quickly next month than it was done last month, the whole act of pilotage for any one ship being governed by the berthing or un-berthing arrangements, the ship's draught in association with the tidal limitations, the weather and the vessel's speed.

There is, no doubt, streamlining which can, and, now, must be done within our own individual station organizations, but the Pilotage Authorities and the ship-owners in their turn must co-operate to abolish out-moded practices and administrative dead-wood.

A recent news release from Trinity House makes public their intention to withdraw the cruising cutter station at Dungeness and replace it with a shore based station at Folkestone, and while the opinions of ship masters have been sought regarding this change, to date the observations of the pilots on how this new system can be most efficiently operated, have not been sought. This scheme, however, will undoubtedly lead to economies in the amount of time spent on duty by pilots when not actually piloting a ship. On the other hand, the Cinque Ports' pilots working rules require two pilots to be on duty in the office out of normal office hours when no office personnel are in attendance. With effect from the first day of this month the hours of the

office staff have been reduced by 35 minutes a day with a consequent increase, by a corresponding amount, of the time spent in the office by the second duty pilot. This is equivalent to 152 hours, or 19 working days extra work for one man in each year. This is neither productive or economical when the pay of a pilot is compared to that of members of the office staff.

It is, also, suggested that consideration be given to the construction at the Sunk, of a tower with a helicopter platform which could be used not only as a pilot station, but as an air sea rescue station and an advance P.L.A. radar station.

Each and every station must have its own ideas on this subject but in order that the best can be made of them, it is absolutely imperative that the pilots' views be made known to the Pilotage Authorities and the ship owners. Every pilot is keen to cut out unproductive work, and attain the maximum leisure time together with the maximum rate for the job. However, I would not be giving away a secret if I said that in more than one London station there are many schools of thought on what should or should not be done. Many of these ideas on streamlining are completely contradictory and should we not now consider employing a consultant work study expert to give guidance? I will conclude by reminding you that at the recently held Labour Party Conference at Blackpool a call was made for the revision of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894. Might this Conference add a rider that while they are about that the Pilotage Act of 1913, in the interests of productivity, could, also, well be revised?

Mr. J. M. HANSON said that in London their productivity had increased by five million tons net in shipping in the past five years, without any increase in pilots. Leave had been increased from 21 to 42 days a year since he joined his station.

"This year we have tried to make all pilots take their 42 days' leave. This has resulted in the River Thames almost coming to a standstill," he said.

They had an entitlement to 100 days' leave, which was now recognised by Trinity House, yet were they to take this 100 days even though it would mean they would "stop shipping in the Thames for at least one day a week?" he asked. At the moment,

in the summer period, when pilots were on holiday, they had to work two shifts in 24 hours.

"You barely get home to change your collar when you are at work again," he said. "Throughout London district, a feeling of despair with our authority is creeping in."

#### Trinity House "Modern as Dodo"

D. I. McMILLAN commented: "Trinity House is as modern as the dodo - and that is extinct. Some of their attitudes go back to 1865."

Mr. GRIFFITHS, said that free time and manning requirements presented problems which had got to be resolved at local level. It was impossible to lay down hard and fast rules.

## THE QUESTION OF AMALGAMATION

"Amalgamation of Pilots' Organizations". This was item six on the agenda for the Conference. No resolution was moved but among the speeches which seemed to make the biggest impression were the following.

#### E. N. Chambers

My contribution to this debate is based on the assumption that the Union pilots still insist that unless we agree to Union status or at least some kind of affiliation to the Trades Union Movement no marriage can take place. If this be so, then progress towards one representative body since we last met has been far from satisfactory and the situation must call for quite a lot of re-thinking in both camps.

It seems abundantly clear that our proposals of last year on the question of single representation were welcomed by the Union pilots which should remove all doubt that the profession as a whole acknowledges the advantages of its affairs being in the hands of a united powerful organization. It would therefore seem to me that the Executives of both organizations have been instructed to work to this end - unfortunately with the laying down of certain conditions. For the moment let us leave out the conditions and examine the wish of the profession. Let us do this as a body of pilots and not as members of any particular organization.

A majority of the piloting community have indicated their belief that their interests can be better served by becoming absorbed

It was difficult to find a balance between the need for reasonable free time and the need to avoid having pilots available but under-employed.

He referred to Belfast as a "very, very difficult problem." He added: "Trinity House, as far as I can see, is most modern and up to date in its thinking compared with our gallant friends the Commissioners at Belfast."

"Their view is that a pilot is on duty when he is on the bridge and not until he is there and he is not on duty the minute he steps off. It is a profoundly wrong view." He hoped they would be reasonable and fair minded: it was a problem of re-thinking.

into a single unit. Once having reached a conclusion of this moment the die is cast; it is absolutely final and it commits the profession to a certain line of action otherwise both bodies of pilots are saying, "Having decided what is best for us we will now depart on our separate ways and do what is worst".

It would seem therefore that in the corridors of power that lie behind the platform of both organizations the question pilots must ask themselves is not, "Shall this take place" - the profession as a whole have supplied the answer to this. The question that requires an answer is "How and when shall this take place?"

This pronouncement of the profession that one voice shall be the ultimate object confirms the answer to the first part of last year's resolution and also the answer to the first of the two questions upon which we were asked to vote in the letter of the 25th May. Finding common ground to produce the desired result falls into the category of the next step and is only relevant in so far that it can delay indefinitely the project upon which we are embarked.

With this in mind we must re-examine the difficulties that keep us apart and I feel that

in doing this we should not only think in terms of ourselves but also in terms of our colleagues on the other side. Let us not take umbrage at the suggestion that we, the majority of the piloting community, are being asked to do all the compromising.

If the proportion of one in three in the voting for amalgamation under the conditions put forward by the Union pilots is correct then it might well be that the opinion of the profession is no more than equally divided on the question of Union status. The possibility cannot be ruled out that due to the frailties of the voting method adopted, quite a different complex might have been put on the issue if all pilots of both organizations had been given the opportunity of voting confidentially and not through the medium of their district. Some of you may recall my laying before you last year what I believed to be some of the difficulties that must be overcome before we could think in terms of affiliating ourselves to the T.U.C. or adopting Union status. I did in fact suggest that with certain guarantees we might consider the possibility of trade union status as an improvement on association representation. I make this point because I have no change in heart on the matter but am permitted the privilege of a change of approach. One thing I did try to make clear was that if these difficulties could be overcome there were many advantages to be had from the trades union movement.

I also put forward the view that our colleagues seemed quite content to remain part of this huge organization despite the fact that the terms of reference under which they performed their duties were quite alien to those under which trade unions survive. I reiterate those remarks and nothing would please me greater than if they were challenged by the Union pilots and proved to be wrong.

In consequence of this I suggest that we convey to the Union pilots the following message. "As an Association we are completely at a loss to understand why you steadfastly persist that the principal condition for amalgamation shall be the maintaining of Union status when the major part of the structure under which you earn your living is in direct opposition to trade union principles. If you feel this is not the

case and that as members of a trade union you do adhere to its principles and in consequence receive its full benefits and protection then meet us at a joint conference and convince us that your way is better suited to represent the profession than ours".

An alternate approach, probably more subtle, would be to concede the fact that it was to our mutual benefit to be a branch of the Transport and General Workers Union, always provided that the officers of that union and not the pilots themselves were prepared to give us the same guarantees and protection that are afforded to all their other members.

If no response is forthcoming to either of these suggestions then it should be clear to us that the question of union status is insecure and the action of having to refuse to give us an honest appraisal of the situation could bring this insecurity home to the Union pilots with greater impact than by us remaining dogmatic to our own point of view.

I put these possibilities to you for two reasons, (1) It has many times been said that delegates are always ready to criticise but very loathe to put forward methods for finding a solution. (2) It is my belief that a solution to this problem must and will be found. If we are to become as one let both organizations come off their pedestals, dismiss any inter-rivalry that may be in existence of which we may not all be aware, so that we can arrive as quickly as possible at the position which commonsense dictates will be to our mutual advantage. Clearly both bodies of pilots have welcomed paying the piper and this project must not fail because of haggling as to who shall call the tune.

The final answer must be in the clear understanding by both bodies of pilots as to what limits a trade union would be prepared to go to protect and further the progress and well-being of the profession. It is no good one section of our community convincing themselves that Union status will not work to our betterment unless we give the Union itself the opportunity of refuting our challenge that its terms of reference are not suitable to our profession.

The pilots of my district have clearly indicated that no condition must stand in the way of unity and their decision is mine.

**G. W. Gibbins**

You will have read the very comprehensive report on the subject by Mr. Griffiths. I would, however, as an Executive member who attended the Joint Executive Meetings, like to pass on a few observations and add what I would call, down to earth fundamentals. You will also have read the Rules and Standing Orders of the proposed National Association of the United Kingdom Pilots, but let us recapitulate.

Mr. O'Leary, a very able negotiator and a man of principle and integrity, has promised to represent us when available. He already is an extremely busy man, being the dockers chief, a member of the National Ports Council and the member of the P.L.A. I feel there would not be much time for pilotage. But perhaps I am doing him an injustice.

Being a member of the new image you are also a member of the T. & G.W.U. and your £7.16s.0d. subscription is for their funds, so indirectly you are paying a political levy to the Labour Party. The funds for the new association would be supplied by a further subscription or levy as deemed necessary by the new association. What would the T. & G.W.U. of approximately a million and a half members do for fifteen hundred pilots? During the Joint Executive meetings held these last few months we were given an insight when Mr. O'Leary attended to implement the last N.M.B. increase. Various percentages were suggested and Mr. O'Leary, no doubt bearing in mind the Government's four per cent norm, suggested that we should accept five per cent in the interim, and he intimated that to demand twelve per cent was like reaching for the moon. The Union Executive remained more or less silent relying completely on Mr. O'Leary.

Your own Executive were astounded and said so in no uncertain manner. Five per cent was totally unacceptable and we would rather call regional meetings, thereby causing withdrawal of services. I feel that had the Labour Party been in Opposition then the moon would have been the objective, but that is my own personal view. Mr. O'Leary, getting the message, as it were, then said he would try to phone the Chamber and we would meet again in the evening. To cut a long story short, we, as you know,

accepted twelve per cent, in my view solely through the militant attitude of your Executive. I was proud to be a member of your Executive that night.

In achieving the implementation of Letch 6(i) it has been a hard and bitter fight against hard-headed business men whom Ted Hill has termed "likeable rascals", who say "no" with a charming smile. Let us also be likeable rascals and apply the same methods in future as we have during the last few months in dire necessity. I refer, of course, to the "regional meetings" method, which in my opinion, tipped the scale in our favour in gaining the twelve per cent instead of five per cent. This was the method suggested by your Association. This achievement is significant. It has gone a long way to Letch 6(i) being re-recognised. It is our due, our birthright and our bread and butter.

Let us digress for a moment. The 56,000 strong dyers, bleachers and textile workers asked the Trade Union Congress for support to declare a certain dye works black, and why didn't they withdraw their union members? I have here a cutting, from a National newspaper, on the T.U.C. at Brighton this year. Let me read the first paragraph.

"A bitter inter-union row over a sixteen month strike had Monday's 'dirty linen' fluttering in the open at the T.U.C. at Brighton yesterday".

The public allegations that three unions - including the E.T.U. and the Power Workers' group of the giant T.G.W.U. - had left a small union battling alone obviously displeased the General Secretary, Mr. George Woodcock. An attempt to stifle the debate and end the embarrassment of the delegates by moving "next business" had already failed when Mr. Woodcock said: "I think this should stop now. It has no future at all".

As I said the union in question is 56,000 strong. What treatment would 1,500 pilots get? If a pilot requires legal representation, the proposed new Association would suggest appointing a local solicitor who probably hasn't the faintest conception of pilotage law. They are not all called Charles Griffiths! What other advantages do the Union offer you? One pound per week for sickness, or dispute, lock-out, or victimisation; Or accident pay, and I nearly forgot,

five to twenty pounds if you drop dead. There are other amenities, such as, free railway fare to and from convalescent homes in the country, and treatment is entirely free - and very commendable too! All right, so much for the T. & G.W.U.

What about the U.K.P.A.? True we cannot afford to send you to convalescent homes, or pay you for lock-outs, or victimisation, etc. But we can come here once a year and tear the Executive Committee to pieces. So what! Without constructive criticism an Executive Committee can stagnate. We have had our share of criticism and we are not in a state of stagnation.

Who were the instigators of the Letch Report? I remember many years ago Sir John Inskip talking about a yard stick. A yard stick did not take form until Mr. Tate and Mr. Griffiths came upon the scene. Hence the Letch Report. Who did the donkey work? Who has done the donkey work in everything we have achieved? What has the Union done for the union pilots? Is it a secret? Or are they ultra-sensitive to praise? I don't know but if any delegate can elucidate I will listen intently.

May I beat the drum for a moment. I wish to state categorically that in your present set-up, namely the U.K.P.A., you have a chairman whose whole life is devoted to the welfare of pilots, who has been summoned to Buckingham Palace to receive an award for services to pilotage. A past Executive member, Mr. J. Innes of Clyde has been awarded the O.B.E. for service to pilotage, and our staunch secretary, Mr. Charles Griffiths, a man of principle, integrity, and to boot an expert on pilotage law. We also have Mr. Farrands and Mr. Balmain who have done mountains of work for E.M.P.A. and pilot ladders respectively.

As you know, at the 1964 Conference, a resolution was put forward for an affiliation to the T. & G.W.U. That resolution has been explored more than any other resolution in all my sixteen years of attending Conferences. The issue is in your hands. I trust that you have been given a mandate by your colleagues and stations. And whatever the final result, let us accept the majority with grace and remain united.

**E. L. Hare - the Voice of Port Talbot**

We at Port Talbot like every other pilot are very much concerned with this question

of amalgamation of pilots' organizations. It is very important bearing in mind the future well-being of pilotage as a whole. We must not lose sight of the fact that pilots in general throughout the country are better off in many respects than they have ever been before. No doubt there are a few exceptions, but in the main, working conditions are better and remuneration more in keeping with the responsibilities of a skilled profession and in appreciation of their skill and experience pilots are being called in for consultation in connection with projects in their Districts.

For example in Port Talbot when the iron ore terminal was first mooted, some of our pilots were called in for their advice. I believe the public in general are beginning to appreciate the fact, that pilotage is a highly skilled and specialised profession and plays a big part in the life of the nation. Bearing in mind all these facts we must do all in our power to safeguard these rights and benefits we fought so hard to get. We can only do so if we have a strong independent association behind us composed of all pilots in the country, united under the leadership of men properly qualified for the job. Fortunately we already have such men in our midst.

Can we get together and create such an organization? The U.K.P.A. pilots say "Yes", the Union pilots say "Yes", but an essential condition of any amalgamation from the point of view of the latter is that the new association should become a branch of the Transport and General Workers' Union. In the first place we must respect their views on this matter and I trust they respect ours.

So let us look at it from the Union pilots' point of view. They have been members of the pilotage section of the Union for many years, probably ten years or more. They maintain quite rightly that during that time all the benefits they now receive were obtained for them by their Union working together with the U.K.P.A. when circumstances warranted it, such as bringing into being the Letch recommendations. They have no doubt every faith and confidence in Mr. T. O'Leary who as we all agree is a very able trade union negotiator of many years' standing, and they no doubt would still wish him to handle their affairs. This is the main reason I believe why they insist

on this affiliation clause which is causing all the trouble. They probably want to have the assurance that they can call on the services of Mr. O'Leary and the support the Union may or would give them, and it is only to be expected that when you work together with men of Mr. O'Leary's type you learn not only to respect them but form friendships which you cannot so easily cast aside.

Well, what are the views of the U.K. pilots? I think we in Port Talbot are not only expressing the views of ourselves but of the majority of the U.K.P.A. pilots when we say we are in favour of the creation of a single professional organization representing every pilot in the country. This new association with an efficient administration, comprising a well equipped and efficient staff, fully qualified full-time officials with the loyal support of every pilot, will in itself be strong enough to safeguard the hard-won benefits of the past and try to better them in the future.

So I sincerely hope the Union pilots will have second thoughts on the affiliation clause. This condition is one we in Port Talbot do not like. We feel that if we are affiliated to a parent body, that body must have a certain amount of control over us, however small, and as Mr. Griffiths has also said, the draft rules clearly show that a substantial amount of Union control would remain over any question of national implication.

I would like to see the Union pilots come in without any strings attached and help to bring into existence this new and stronger organization.

### Retirements

#### MR. L. R. SLADE

Mr. L. R. Slade who has been a Cardiff pilot since 1938 retires on the 3rd January, and it is appropriate now to say a few words about his career. Our cheerful picture speaks well for one who has served the pilots a good many years. He has been a member of the Cardiff Pilotage Authority and was elected to the Executive Committee of the U.K.P.A. in July 1952, but in view of his approaching retirement did not offer himself for re-election at this Conference.



After his apprenticeship in the Cardiff Pilotage Service he went "before the mast" in one of the last sailing ships afloat, the *Garthsnaid*. They were dismantled in the Bass Straits in April 1923. The *White Star Zealandic* picked them up and towed them into Melbourne. The barque was brought in but was a constructional loss and the crew were consequently sent home. He was the last apprentice to do sailing ship time in the Bristol Channel, but at one time this was compulsory. After arriving home he passed for his second mate's certificate and in October 1927 obtained his master's foreign going certificate. He then became first officer of one of the *R. S. Dalgleish* tramps and eventually took command.

#### MR. P. J. HANNAN

IT IS with regret we have to announce the premature retirement, through deafness, of one of the best known figures in the London Pilotage District—Mr. P. J. Hannan. "P.J.", or "Uncle Jack" as he is affectionately known by his colleagues of the River Medway station—and by most of the pilots of the London Pilotage District with whom he came in contact, has always taken



a keen and active interest in pilotage affairs and we are pleased to know that he intends to continue to give us his advice and the benefit of his experience. He was for a number of years a well known figure at the annual Conference of this Association, speaking mainly to motions that were then considered against the natural order of things but which, now, are accepted as being commonplace—or common-sense.

Having strong convictions on the value of concerted action and representation, P.J. was a founder member of the London Pilots' Council and takes great pleasure from the fact that he was the first Medway Pilot to join the U.K.P.A. He tells the story that, while acting as local secretary he "saved a lot of time and trouble" by paying a block subscription to the Association out of station funds and enrolled all his colleagues without them being aware of his actions until they each received their membership books. The River Medway station has had 100% membership of the U.K.P.A. since that day and similar methods of enrolment are still employed!

Speaking about his career, Uncle Jack said he supposed he couldn't say he ran away to sea, because he was already destined for a sea career and arrangements had been completed for him to start his cadetship early in 1919 when his uncle was master with the P. & O. However, on an afternoon early in July 1917, while home on holiday from his Hereford school, he calmly announced to an astonished mother and aunt that he had "signed-on as deck boy in the s.s. *Gerent* and was ordered aboard at one

minute past midnight". His actions may have surprised his mother then—they would not surprise us who well know his dislike of anchoring or hanging about.

After obtaining his second mate's certificate in 1922, P.J. joined the Sunderland firm of Messrs. R. Ritson who specialised in the West Coast of South America trade. He served in many of the "branch boats", getting the remainder of his tickets and then, in order to get qualifying experience for the London District Pilotage Service, joined Messrs. Wm. Cory & Son, in 1931. He obtained his pilot's licence in September 1935.

At that time commercial traffic to the River Medway consisted mainly of colliers and the short-sea traders carrying wood-pulp and logs to the neighbouring paper mills. There were six pilots, two of whom were "exempt" men. Today the pattern of trade and volume of shipping in the river is very different and the station has a present strength of 29 men. Much of the increased trade is due to the building of the B.P. Refinery at the Isle of Grain. Much of the credit for the harmony with which the transition has been made and the efficiency of the station itself is due to the wisdom and foresight Mr. Hannan showed in the early negotiations with all sections of the industry, his tact, and his unflinching sense of humour during the few, but inevitable periods of stress and strain.

Someone once said of the time, in 1935, when Jack joined the Service "The Medway has never been the same since". With his departure thirty years later, it will certainly not be the same again.

A farewell party was held on 1st November when his colleagues of the River Medway made a presentation to mark their esteem and affection and at which representatives from all sections of the industry were present to join in their wishes for a long and happy retirement for Jack and Mrs. Hannan.

Colin A. Rhodes.

## RADAR TRAINING AND PILOTAGE

In the closing stages of Conference on the first day Mr. TATE announced that the Chamber of Shipping had made a preliminary approach to the Association on the possibility of pilots being given leave to attend radar courses and refresher courses.

It was felt, said Mr. Tate, that there had been so many developments in radar in recent years that it was "passing by" some of the older pilots.

Delegates pointed out that such courses would need to be designed specifically for pilots and Mr. Tate asked delegates to consider the idea and report back to their stations.

Mr. Griffiths has since been in touch with the Chamber of Shipping and Captain F. J. Wylie, the Director of its Radio Advisory Service, whose permission we have received to publish his letter of 18th November as follows:

Dear Mr. Griffiths -

Mr. Greenwood passed to me your letter of the 2nd November. The information you want is I think as follows:

Simulator courses are carried out at London, Southampton, Cardiff, Liverpool, Glasgow, South Shields and Hull. The courses last five days and the charges are between £3. and £5.5s, but these are subject to revision in 1966. The enclosure to this letter shows the address of each of the schools.

I agree with you that the syllabus used by the schools for the simulator courses at the present time may not exactly fit the requirements of pilots since it is, I think, devoted almost entirely to the use of radar for avoiding collision. I understand that ships are often under pilotage while they are in reasonably open waters such as the Channel or the southern North Sea, so pilots concerned with that kind of work will need to be aware of the principles and practice of avoiding collision even if plotting etc., is carried out by a ships' officer.

In narrow waters the collision problems are somewhat different but not necessarily

more difficult. It may be that more emphasis could be given to the narrow water aspect of the matter because this would also be of interest to masters. You will appreciate that these are personal opinions.

After talking with Mr. Greenwood it seems possible that pilots are expecting to be able to obtain useful guidance in radar navigation as applied to their own particular areas while doing a simulator course. Admittedly, transparencies representing particular areas can be used with the simulator but these cannot reproduce the ever changing radar picture of the shore, which is seen from the moving ship.

It is my personal view that the best way to learn the radar appearance of any locality is to study the P.P.I. while ships are proceeding through the area in clear weather.

I am not certain that I fully understand what you describe as the rather specialised needs of pilots, but perhaps you will enlighten me.

Yours sincerely,

F. J. Wylie.

### Enclosure

#### RADAR SIMULATOR COURSES

Cardiff - Welsh College of Advance Technology, Cathays Park, Cardiff.

Glasgow - School of Navigation, University of Strathclyde, George Street, Glasgow, C.1.

Hull - Nautical College, Boulevard, Hull, Yorkshire.

Liverpool - Department of Navigation, College of Technology, Byrom Street, Liverpool, 3.

London - Sir John Cass College, Jewry Street, Aldgate, London, E.C.3.

Southampton - School of Navigation, University of Southampton, Warsash, Southampton.

South Shields - Marine and Technical College, Westoe, South Shields, Co. Durham.

The matter will now be followed up by the Executive with the Chamber of Shipping, and all members will be notified as soon as possible of arrangements which can be made to attend these courses.

## DUNGENESS PILOT STATION

The CORPORATION of TRINITY HOUSE has distributed to masters of ships whose pilots use the pilot cutter at Dungeness a questionnaire designed to test the masters' reactions to a proposal to replace this cruising cutter by launches operating from Folkestone. The questionnaire, printed in four languages, asks whether the shipmaster will be prepared to ship or land his pilot off Folkestone, or in bad weather off Dover; and whether he will be prepared to co-operate in a trial of this new scheme for 12 months.

If the answers given to the questionnaire show that the proposal will be welcome, Trinity House will go ahead with trials. Two types of boat are in mind for the shipping of pilots from Folkestone: one is a boat based on the 40 foot, 20 knot, fibreglass pilot boat *Vigia* which Trinity House had built last year for use between Ryde pier and the pilot cutter stationed near the Nab tower; or a boat based on the R.N.L.I.'s 45 foot American type new life-boat.

A study of the local meteorological records has shown that an onshore wind with a speed of over 30 knots can be expected for some 30 days a year, which may prevent the launches operating from Folkestone on these days. Dungeness is partly used by the present cutter because of the shelter that she can get on either side of Dungeness point; this shelter would not be available to a boat operating from Folkestone. It is envisaged that the boat would ship and land pilots some two miles off Folkestone. A limiting factor is that there is a sunken explosives vessel in this area, which would have to be dispersed before it would be safe for shipping and landing pilots.

If the scheme can be worked, Trinity House say there will be considerable saving in cost and time. The pilots would work from the shore instead of cruising or having to stay in the cutter till they are landed, and the capital and operating costs of the launches would be far below those of the cruising cutters. It is expected that there would be an eventual saving in manpower, but Trinity House has promised that none of the officers or ratings now employed by

it would suffer as the result of the new scheme.

A similar scheme was brought into operation in the Isle of Wight district five years ago, when the cruising cutter at the Needles station was successfully replaced by a fast launch operating from the shore. A special pilot-house was built overlooking Totland Bay, and a similar building may be required in Folkestone.

## INVESTITURE

COMING to London for an Investiture is the culmination of what is probably the most pleasant and stimulating experience in one's life.

Dutifully reading through the lists of New Year and Birthday Honours year after year and, when a friend's name appears, writing a letter of congratulation, leaves one quite detached apart from an almost subconscious feeling that it is all part of the British Institution and a very pleasant tradition.

When one's own name appears, however, although not exactly unexpected, there is a feeling almost of shock. Not until the letters arrive - all sincere, kind and so heartening - does one begin to breathe normally again. The sun shines a little more strongly; people smile a little more; the world somehow has become more pleasant. And one's own cloth! - that, I think is the biggest shock. People with whom one has lived and worked and planned for the future; people whom one has accepted as part of the daily life. Suddenly they become very close - part of the Honour itself.

For one's family, of course, it is an Occasion unsurpassed. Without their help and forbearance it would probably never have happened, and it is thus very much Their Day.

The drive to the Palace is almost an anticlimax; but as one passes through into the inner courtyard the atmosphere, the air of tradition and the superb organization makes one realise for the first time that one is there as a guest of Her Majesty, and that is the predominant feeling until one finally crosses the courtyard to the familiar pavement outside.

J.H.I.

## Obituary

## LADY APSLEY

With great regret we heard that LADY APSLEY, one of our honorary vice-presidents died at her home at Cirencester on 19th January.

Lady Apsley who was the widow of Lieut.-Colonel Lord Apsley, M.P. was 70 years of age and kept up her link with the U.K.P.A. from the time he was killed in a plane accident while on active service in the Middle East. A picture of Lord and Lady Apsley appeared in *The Pilot* of May 1925, when writing from Singapore he accepted the invitation of the Executive to become President of the Association. He met the Executive and had his official introduction to the Association on 9th December, 1925.

In the following year at the Conference at Southampton, a constituency which he represented in Parliament, he took the chair throughout the proceedings.

It was no ordinary globe-trotting holiday on which Lord Apsley was engaged when the pilots elected him President. He went to Australia with a set purpose of getting first hand information regarding the immigration question and so thoroughly did he undertake the job that he went for three months as a farm hand without his identity being discovered. He assumed the name of George Bott who was his batman at one time. To avoid any suspicion Lady Apsley boarded the ship at Toulon and travelled as far as Port Said where she disembarked for the purpose of meeting her stepfather in Jerusalem. Lord Apsley went on to Australia and obtained a job as a farm hand on a dairy farm at 20s. a week and his keep. It was not until he wanted to go to Singapore to meet Lady Apsley that he declared himself to the authorities and the bank to get money to go to Singapore.

Returning to Australia with Lady Apsley he took part in a motor expedition in the Northern Territory and subsequently they travelled by air from Derby to Perth about 2,000 miles in three and a half days. Their identity was concealed by the assumed name of Mr. and Mrs. James which was known only to the West Australian Minister of Lands. For a time they occupied quarters

in one of the blocks of the pioneering districts of the West South West. With his next door neighbours he had a contract entailing burning timber, lopping and clearing, pulling up small trees, etc., while Lady Apsley looked after the house and garden and baked bread.

When they got back to England they were met at Plymouth by a deputation of the local pilots including Eldon Evans, W. Shaw and E. Screech.

While out with the Vale of White Hart (Earl Bathurst's Hunt) in December 1930 Lady Apsley's mount fell and rolled over her. After this she had to use a wheel chair from which she conducted a vigorous by-election campaign against the forceful Miss Jennie Lee. She was elected Conservative M.P. for Bristol Central in 1943 and when introduced into the House of Commons she was wheeled to the Bar of the House which cheered her as she manoeuvred her chair to take the oath and sign the roll. She was defeated in the 1945 General Election and again in 1950 when she contested Bristol North East.

In July 1938 *The Pilot* published a full page picture of the pilot cutter *Lady Apsley* at Westminster Bridge. Lady Apsley was brought down in her wheel chair by her husband and she performed the little ceremony of hoisting the vessel's name flag. The cutter was in charge of Mr. J. A. Sparrow.

Neither as an M.P., A.T.S. officer, nor as a director of Western Airways from 1936 to 1955 was she daunted by her accident, which left her partially paralysed. She was joint master of the V.W.H. Hunt from 1946 to 1956 and had written books on horsemanship and foxhunting.

Lady Apsley, who was appointed C.B.E. in 1952, married Lord Apsley in 1923.

She had two sons, the present Earl Bathurst and Mr. George Bertram Bathurst.

We also regret to record the sudden death of two well-known members, Mr. W. C. Duncan of the Cinque Ports who collapsed and died from a heart attack, and Mr. E. A. Greenwood of Goole who was drowned as a result of an accident while on duty. Our sincere sympathies are extended to their families, and we hope shortly to be publishing fuller obituary notices.