§ 783.33 Employment “as a seaman” depends on the work actually performed.

Whether an employee is “employed as a seaman”, within the meaning of the Act, depends upon the character of the work he actually performs and not on what it is called or the place where it is performed (Walling v. Haden, 153 F. 2d 196; Cuascut v. Standard Dredging Corp., 94 F. Supp. 197). Merely because one works aboard a vessel (Helena Glenendale Ferry Co. v. Walling, 132 F. 2d 616; Walling v. Bay State Dredging & Contracting Co., 149 F. 2d 346), or may be articulated as a seaman (see Walling v. Haden, supra), or performs some maritime duties (Walling v. Bay State Dredging & Contracting Co., 149 F. 2d 346; Anderson v. Manhattan Lighterage Corp., 148 F. 2d 971) one is not employed as a seaman within the meaning of the Act unless one’s services are rendered primarily as an aid in the operation of the vessel as a means of transportation, as for example services performed substantially as an aid to the vessel in navigation. For this reason it would appear that employees making repairs to vessels between navigation seasons would not be “employed as” seamen during such a period. (See Desper v. Starved Rock Ferry Co., 342 U.S. 187; but see Walling v. Keansburg Steamboat Co., 162 F. 2d 405 in which the seaman exemption was allowed in the case of an article employee provided he also worked in the ensuing navigation period but not in the case of unarticled employees who only worked during the lay-up period.) For the same and other reasons, stevedores and longshoremen are not employed as seamen. (Knudson v. Lee & Simmons, Inc., 163 F. 2d 95.) Stevedores or roustabouts traveling aboard a vessel from port to port whose principal duties require them to load and unload the vessel in port would not be employed as seamen even though during the voyage they may perform from time to time certain services of the same type as those rendered by other employees who would be regarded as seamen under the Act.

§ 783.34 Employees aboard vessels who are not “seamen”.

Concessionaires and their employees aboard a vessel ordinarily do not perform their services subject to the authority, direction, and control of the master of the vessel, except incidentally, and their services are ordinarily not rendered primarily as an aid in the operation of the vessel as a means of transportation. As a rule, therefore, they are not employed as seamen for purposes of the Act. Also, other employees working aboard vessels, whose service is not rendered primarily as an aid to the operation of the vessel as a means of transportation are not employed as seamen (Knudson v. Lee & Simmons, Inc., 163 F. 2d 95; Walling v. Haden, 153 F. 2d 196, certiorari denied 32 U.S. 866). Thus, employees on floating equipment who are engaged in the construction of docks, levees, revetments or other structures, and employees engaged in dredging operations or in the digging or processing of sand, gravel, or other materials are not employed as seamen within the meaning of the Act but are engaged in performing essentially industrial or excavation work (Sternberg Dredging Co. v. Walling, 158 F. 2d 678; Walling v. Haden, supra; Walling v. Bay State Dredging & Contracting Co., 149 F. 2d 346; Walling v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 149 F. 2d 9, certiorari denied 327 U.S. 722). Thus, “captains” and “deck hands” of launches whose dominant work was industrial activity performed as an integrated part of harbor dredging operations and not in furtherance of transportation have been held not to be employed as seamen within the meaning of the Act (Cuascut v. Standard Dredging Corp. 94 F. Supp. 197).

§ 783.35 Employees serving as “watchmen” aboard vessels in port.

Various situations are presented with respect to employees rendering watchman or similar service aboard a vessel in port. Members of the crew, who render such services during a temporary stay in port or during a brief lay-up for minor repairs, are still employed as “seamen”. Where the vessel is laid up for a considerable period,