

The 2nd S.S.No.3 became due 10.26.

The Saigon Surveyor (Mr.Mann) stated in September 1926 that as Saigon was the vessel's home port and the headquarters of the Superintendent Engineer the Owners were anxious that all work be done there by their own staff and under their own supervision.

The Surveyor was authorized to carry out the survey, but on his retirement from the Society's service the Owners were asked to make arrangements for the survey to be carried out at a port where one of the Society's Surveyors was stationed, the most suitable ports in the vicinity of Saigon being Singapore and Hong Kong.

On his return to this Country Mr. Mann stated, in a letter dated the 4th August last, that the Owners were anxious to have the survey held at Saigon if possible and asked him to endeavour to arrange at Singapore for a Surveyor to be sent specially.

Mr. Mann added that when in Singapore he had a conversation with Mr. Matthews, the Surveyor at that port, who was to consider the matter, and in the meantime the Owners had been asked to apply direct to Singapore.

The Singapore Surveyor, in reply to enquiry, stated he had interviewed the Owners' Agents at that port and there had evidently been some misunderstanding as the steamer appeared to have been laid up from the 22nd April until the 15th July 1927 when a sum of 50,000 dollars was spent on repairs stated to be in accordance with Lloyd's Specialists' instructions, and it also appeared that the screw shaft had been drawn and examined by Lloyd's Surveyor.

Mr. Matthews further stated nothing definite could be arranged and the Agents were writing to Saigon for instructions. He also stated he was requested to proceed to Saigon, but as this

009401-009408-0114 1/3

meant a sea journey of 600 miles and he had 3 vessels shortly coming under Special Survey, it was impossible for him to do so. The vessel was stated to be under charter to the French Government.

The case received consideration on the 7th October when the Owners were asked to state what arrangements had been made for the survey to be carried out, and a copy of the letter received from the Singapore Surveyor was forwarded to Mr. Mann for his remarks.

Mr. Mann in reply stated definitely that the vessel underwent no such docking as referred to above and pointed out that this was clear in view of the fact that he sailed in the steamer from Saigon to Singapore, leaving the latter port on the 6th June last and in the circumstances it was impossible for the vessel to be docked during the period stated without his knowledge.

Mr. Mann suggests that the repairs referred to were carried out in 1926 as the vessel was docked about that date when the screw shaft was drawn and examined, and an examination of the donkey boiler was the last occasion on which he surveyed the vessel. The vessel was laid up until after the donkey boiler was examined and he would regard the sum stated to have been spent as a maximum figure and probably half would very likely be nearer the mark, and it was not spent by his orders but merely by way of annual refit, and he was not encouraged to investigate further than the propeller shaft and the boilers, the furnaces of which were extensively welded.

From an examination of the reports received in 1926 it is found that the vessel was examined in dry dock at Saigon in June of that year, the spare screwshaft fitted and a number of minor repairs effected, but nothing was specially opened out for inspection.

The boiler survey was subsequently reported to have been

partly held during the same month and repairs effected to the furnaces and this survey was reported to have been completed in July 1926.

The Owners now write as follows:-

"In reply to your letter of the 7th October last we hasten to inform you that you must have received all necessary information respecting the "G.G. ROUME", and the classification which we have asked for this vessel from your Agent at Singapore, who at present possesses all the necessary elements of investigation, which he would have taken too long to have sent in useful time.

We hope that you are now in possession of his report and that at last you can give us satisfaction.

We take the liberty to point out to you the deficiency which exists in your Organisation on account of your not having at Saigon, which is however, an important place, a Lloyds Surveyor qualified to Superintend the work carried out on vessels and to issue the necessary certificates.

This causes interminable length of time and considerable additional expenses liable to dishearten people with the best intentions."

The year of grace expired 10.27.

The case is submitted for the consideration of the Committee.

RECEIVED & SENT
TUES. 3 JAN 1928
Deferred *[Signature]* 29. 12. 27. *[Signature]*

*Cable Eng.
must at Eng
within
2 mos or lose class*
[Signature]



© 2020

Lloyd's Register
Foundation