

With regard to what is termed a deficiency in the through butt bolts, or which were not in accordance with the Rules, we beg to remark that when this vessel was built (1853) the Rules only required through butt bolts from lower part of keel to lower part of bilge and we have no doubt from the facts reported as renewed but that the so-called deficiency existed in the butts of the flat of bottom which were not required by the Rules of 1853 to be through bolted and we are informed by the Owner that the butts of the flat of bottom have now been through bolted which bears out the inference we have drawn from the Report, we think therefore that if Mr. Treloar had but referred to the Rules under which the Ship was built he would not have alluded to the absence of butt bolts at that part as a deficiency per Rule, or, as not in accordance with the Rules.

We would further remark that Mr. Light, who was present at the Survey with ourselves and Mr. Waymouth, concurred in the opinions expressed by us respecting the renewal of the ceiling and further remarked that if the extended period of 10 years was contemplated, the Cold Beam clamps should be renewed, this we had on a prior Survey recommended in order to prevent disappointment to the Ship owner at a very distant period.

Ordered  
That Messrs. Steel & Co. be informed, that when ships are surveyed either for Continuation or Restoration, or the Asterisk Character, the Rules in force when they are so surveyed, must be complied with as regards the Bolts and Nuts in question, unless good cause be shown to the Committee, in each case, why a relaxation should be allowed.

Read the observations of the London Surveyors hereon.



explanations and remarks will prove  
satisfactory — We are.

Sir,  
Your obedient servants  
(Signed) { William B. Carey  
E. C. Wheeler

For W. B. Carey  
are desired to report  
in the statements contained herein  
C. B. S.

(Copy) Liverpool Dec. 6th 1869  
Robert E. W. W. W. Esq.

Sir, In reply to the questions  
proposed by the General Committee regarding  
the repairs recently effected, in London, on  
the M. "Clara" of this Port, and our  
report of the vessel dated July 1867, we beg  
respectfully to say that the ceiling at  
that time, nearly 2 1/2 years since, did not  
escape our attention and we feel assured  
that the Committee on reading our  
Report of that date in conjunction  
with our letter of the 3rd Aug. 1867 cannot  
fail to observe that great attention was  
devoted to the necessities of the case and if  
it is altogether improbable that after having  
had such a large amount of ceiling  
removed we should have permitted to  
remain any portion then rotten —

We drew the attention of the owner  
to the shabby condition of some of the  
ceiling not removed, but Mr. Weymouth  
considered that with the increase of strength  
to be given by the then proposed diagonal  
doubling, such should be permitted to  
remain from which expression of  
opinion we drew the inference that  
diagonal doubling was considered to  
compensate for some deficiencies in the  
inside planking, and this opinion  
appeared to have been taken by the owner  
and carried out when he finally  
determined putting on the doubling  
longitudinally, so are not altogether



surprised at some of the ceiling after the lapse of nearly 2½ years requiring renewal -

As stated in our letter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> August 1867, the repairs subsequent to Mr. Waymouth's visit and survey were carried out entirely on the Owners responsibility as will be seen from the following quotation of the two last clauses of that letter

"We may observe that Mr. Waymouth considered we had suggested more than was necessary which appears to have influenced the Owners in a great measure in the course they have pursued"

In conclusion we beg to state that after Mr. Waymouth's survey and interview with Mr. Stuarth the repairs and strengthening were performed irrespective of the requirements of the Rules, regardless of any recommendations made by us, and the decision left for the decision of the Committee on the merits of the case"

We notice with regret that Mr. Pretious in making his Report has thought proper to use such a very strong term as "thoroughly rotten" our opinion of its impropriety is strengthened by the general tenor of his report and we would, as an illustration, point to the last clause of his report which runs thus "side keelsons found bad. have been repaired and made good." for if such a description of them be correct they should in our opinion have been renewed -