



4 Bernard Street.

Leith 10th June 1879

The Secretary
Lloyd's Register of Shipping
London.

Sir,

S.S. 'Ella'.

I have received your letter of the 9th inst. - in answer to which I beg to say that I adhere to my protest against the course you propose to adopt in entering this Steamer in your Register with a red ring over the fig. 1. on the grounds:-

- 1st That such an entry would be misleading and contrary to fact.
- 2nd That it would be injurious to the interests of the Owners of the 'Ella'.

Reserving to myself full right to adopt whatever course I may see fit, I beg to ask you to be so good as specify

- 1st Wherein the boiler is defective, and what repairs you consider necessary in order to make it safe.
- 2nd What test you would propose to apply to it in order to prove whether the boiler is sufficient or not for the pressure carried upon it viz: 50^{lb}.

This is the more necessary as your Surveyor made no recommendations whatever as to repairs, and it is therefore incorrect to

state as you do in your letter of 27th ~~last~~ that his recommendations had not been carried out. Moreover he did not see the boiler tested nor under steam, nor did he ask to see it under these conditions.

One other point I beg to bring before you namely, that I never asked for the M.C. or fig. 1. W. Dawkins proposed it, and I at once told him that it was not my intention to apply for the Machinery Certificate and therefore unnecessary to call in W. Shurrock. My reasons as I told him were, that while perfectly satisfied with the efficiency of the Machinery & boiler, I was not prepared to go into alterations & expenses such as might ^{now} be required to get the Certificate; particularly as I had so recently spent a large sum in an extensive overhaul & repair.

It was not until the day before the *Ellis* was to come out of Drydock that Mr Dawkins informed me that such a survey was imperative in any case. Had this been distinctly stated to me at first & that it was no longer in my option to have the engines & boilers surveyed, I would have had them opened out & submitted for survey before any repairs were done.

As it was, I told W. Dawkins that the Surveyor should have every facility if he came, but as the *Ellis* was all but ready for sea I could not then have everything opened out for a proper survey.

It is in these circumstances that you propose to press upon me what I never asked, and to punish me for not doing what I was ~~never~~ asked to do, and see no necessity for doing.

I may here be allowed to say that I have always had great satisfaction in dealing with your Surveyors, & have always done my utmost to meet their wishes. It is accordingly very undesirable & quite unnecessary that there should be any hitch now.

Waiting your reply I am, Sir,
Your obed^t Serv^t
James Formack

P.S. I have no objection to your dropping the Fig 1. & entering her only as "90A."
but I can never agree to the red ring.
R.



© 2021

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

1R0N535-0093 1/2

11/6/79 In Parker trust

Imp Dawkins & Sturrock
to report *MS*

Noted *MS*
11.6.79

1879
Leith 10 June
McCormack

Re 11
Ltr to Ltr 11/6/79 Cn 20
"Elia"



© 2021

Lloyd's Register
Foundation