

455.409

Mr. Bainbridge, of Messrs. Harris & Dixon representing the Owners, called at this Office on 23rd March, during which visit he stated that:-

- (1) He had not previously been informed that the class that would be recommended to the Committee would be for a limited service.
- (2) He believed that the ship had been previously employed on ocean-going service, and was fit for that service.

He suggested that the Society was not quite sure whether or not this ship had been built originally to the Germanischer Lloyd class "K", that is Greater Coasting Class, and he arranged to visit this Office on Wednesday of next week, (that is the 29th,) to see if the result of our re-examination of this case would be to recommend unlimited service.

The case has been re-examined and no departure from the previous recommendation is considered justified. (For grounds for previous recommendation see endorsement 13.3.50).

In the circumstances it is submitted that Messrs. Harris & Dixon, Newcastle, be communicated with on the following lines, as little can be gained by awaiting Mr. Bainbridge's visit:-

As requested by Mr. Bainbridge, the question of classification of this ship has been re-examined and it has been ascertained that the ship was built in 1921 to the Germanischer Lloyd class with the notation "K" which limited the service. This limitation has continued throughout the period the ship appeared in the Germanischer Lloyd Register, and there is no evidence of this 29-year old ship having ever been employed regularly on ocean service.

In regard to the statement that no warning had been given of a possible limitation in service, we have on record a note that your Company telephoned this Office on 14th December, 1949, in regard to this question and a telephonic reply was given on the 20th December.

When the ship was operating under a yearly examination by Lloyd's Register the Load Line Certificates were endorsed limiting trading to between ports in Great Britain and Ireland and ports on the Continent of Europe. In addition, the British Corporation Surveyor who dealt with this survey in its early stages has stated that he had in mind recommending classification with similar service limits. A re-examination of the scantlings, etc., has not shown any additional feature that would enable a recommendation to be made for unlimited service.

So far as the Society is concerned, in a case such as this where the ship is not considered suitable for unlimited service, the trading limits desired must be precisely defined by the Owners, and if approved an appropriate qualification of class ~~for~~ defining of limits would appear in the Register Book. In the event of a change of service being desired at some later date the notation could be amended to suit any comparable service anywhere.

It would be appreciated, therefore, if you would be good enough to state the service intended for the "OAKLEY".

© 2021
Lloyd's Register
27th March, 1950.
011227-011234-0042