



# Lloyd's Register of British & Foreign Shipping,

LLOYD'S REGISTER  
LONDON.

Pendennis House,

Lansdowne Road,

Falmouth, 21<sup>st</sup> March 1904

RECD 23 MAR. 1904

ANSR

75/3/04

5 Enclosures

Reference

D

The Secretary  
Sir

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 18<sup>th</sup> inst, with enclosures relating to the case of the S.S. "Deerhound" No 171 in the Register Book, and with regard thereto would respectfully submit the following explanation:-

This vessel became due for her second S.S. No 2 in October 1902, I paid my first visit to her on 3<sup>rd</sup> November last, when she came to this Port for the purpose of having a new boiler fitted, upon pointing out to the Owners representative (Mr Vincent) that the vessel was overdue, for survey, and informing him as to the requirements of the Survey, he stated that if there was much required to be done, the Owners would not continue the class, as the vessel was practically sold, subject to the boiler being renewed, I told him I could give him no idea of the extent of the repairs, until the vessel was opened out for examination, as required by the Rules. The special survey was proceeded with, and upon the boiler being fitted out, the vessel was found to be in a very bad condition at this part necessitating large repairs, and the greater

FAL 138-0147 (116)

greater part of the ceiling throughout the ship was also in such a state as to require renewal. I paid many more visits to this vessel than is usual for such a survey, with the object of assisting the Owners to the best of my power, and preventing any unnecessary delay, by examining, and passing the work in very small portions, so that the cleaning, and painting could be proceeded with as rapidly as possible, and spent a considerable amount of time in arranging the necessary details of repairs in the boiler room, so that they could be effected in the most economical manner for the Owner consistent with efficiency. The whole of the work was carried out to my satisfaction, and apparently amicably with the Owners, until it came to the recommendation of the Mast. As soon as the wedges were removed, I examined the Mast, and found the Fore Mast defective, this was on the 4<sup>th</sup> January, and it was recommended to the Owners that the Mast be renewed. The Owners stated they would renew the Mast on her arrival at Fowey, which is another part of my district. The vessel was placed in the dry dock here on the 16<sup>th</sup> January, the cables were then ranged in the dock bottom, and all the equipment examined except the hawsers, which could not be seen on deck. On the 22<sup>nd</sup> January when the new Mast arrived, I requested him to let me see the Laidline & hawsers, but he said he was unable to find them, and upon enquiry

enquiry of the Captain, I was informed there was no lowline  
 on board, I requested him to inform the Owners, that a new  
 Low rope and a 5" hawser were required to complete the Ruler  
 Equipments, and I also wrote the Superintendent, to the  
 same effect, the vessel shortly after left Falmouth, and I  
 was given to understand she was proceeding to Torrey,  
 where the new Foremast, and ropes were to be renewed to  
 complete the survey. On the 25<sup>th</sup> January I again wrote to  
 the Superintendent regarding the ropes and Mast, but could  
 get no definite information concerning them. On the  
 9<sup>th</sup> February I visited Torrey to survey another vessel, and  
 met the Owners representative, who in reply to my inquiry  
 stated, that the Mast was made, and the ropes ready to be  
put on board, and that the vessel was expected there that  
night, and I examined the new Mast at the ship builders  
 yard before leaving Torrey. About the middle of February  
 as I had received no word from the Owners, I requested  
 Mr Cooper my Engineer Colleague, who was visiting Torrey,  
 to call on the Owners, and ascertain when they proposed  
 to complete the survey on this vessel, and he was informed  
 it would be in the course of a few days. On the 27<sup>th</sup> February  
 as there was still no word from the Owners, I again wrote  
 them, and received a Telegram in reply on the 1<sup>st</sup> March  
 informing me that the "Deerhound" was at Pax, and  
 requesting

requesting me to examine the Mast in place, with a view as I thought to completing the survey, I visited the vessel, and after examining the Mast, was surprised to learn that the ropes were not supplied, and the Captain did not know even if they were ordered. I wrote the Owners the following day & received a letter from their representative dated 5<sup>th</sup> March, please find attached stating that the ropes would be placed on board in Liverpool "this time" probably on the 7<sup>th</sup> inst, and that he would inform me when they were on board. On the 15<sup>th</sup> inst, I saw the vessel reported as arriving at Torrey, and being anxious to complete the survey, which was now 17 months over due, I telephoned to the Owners office, and was informed the Principals were not in, and and they did not know whether the ropes were on board or not, but that the vessel was sailing from Torrey that night. I informed them I would come to Torrey in the afternoon thinking the ropes would be on board, but later on when I was about leaving for the train received a message stating that the ropes were not on board. I was very much upset at the manner in which the Owners, and their representative appeared to be treating me, and wrote the letter which they have forwarded on to you; by their continual promises they had led me to delay reporting the vessel, and so far as I could see there appeared very little prospect of the ropes being placed on board.

On the 16<sup>th</sup> inst I received a letter from the Owners representative dated the previous day, stating that the delay in placing the ropes on board had arisen over some question relating to the quality of the Coir rope, yet he told me on the 9<sup>th</sup> Feb that they were all ready to be put on board, but made no reference in this letter as to when they would be placed on board, and I observe from the Owners letter to you dated the 16<sup>th</sup> inst, they now say the ropes are awaiting the vessel at Preston. These statements have been made constantly since the 9<sup>th</sup> Feb last, when the Superintendent told me the ropes were ready to be placed on board on the vessels arrival at Fowey, later on at Liverpool, now at Preston. I can only express my sincere regret that any remarks of mine contained in my letter of the 16<sup>th</sup> inst to Messrs Lorne, Carter & Co, should have been considered by them as a veiled threat, nothing was further from my thoughts, my desire being solely to point out to them as I had previously pointed out to their Superintendent, that the vessel was liable to have the figure 1 taken from the class, unless the necessary equipment was supplied, and to draw their attention to the fact that I could delay the report on the vessel no longer, but must forward it at once to London, when the case would receive the consideration of the Committee. I trust this explanation will be considered satisfactory by the Committee, and would most respectfully state that it has always been my earnest endeavour to perform

My

my duties at all times in a courteous manner towards  
 Owners, and their superintendants, and to any one whom  
 I meet in business, and so far as I am aware to such  
 statement as that now made, that I am lacking in courtesy has  
 ever been made previously regarding me. On the contrary I  
 have on several occasions received letters from shipowners  
 thanking me for the assistance I have at times been able to  
 render them, when their vessels have been under survey or  
 repairs. Messrs. Loyne Carter & Co themselves when their steamer  
 Par was under survey at this Port in December last, thanked  
 me for the assistance, and attention I had given to the case;  
 and they have on several occasions during the 8 or 9 years they  
 have been ship owners consulted me in reference to their  
 vessels; our relations have hitherto been of the most friendly  
 character, and I am very sorry they should have interpreted my  
 letter in a manner was certainly not intended by me  
 at the time of writing. Sorry I have to trouble you with  
 such a long letter.

I am  
 Sir

Your obedient servant

J. H. Sandry

*Referred to the Chief Ship Surveyor.*

*YB*

23 MAR 1904

*Also for Mr. Hill to note.*



© 2019

Lloyd's Register  
Foundation