

Dec 7th 1886

Highland

Leander

Rec 27/12/16

M. W. George

Dear Sir

In looking over the report made
by Mr. M. H. H. the Owner of the
Society of the Laiden which
was built by me in June
last. I remember he wrote
to me about some minor things
which he said should have
been supplied. I replied
and consented to have those
things put right. There being
sufficient funds I considered
in his hands to cover the
expenses.

On the 15th of September

he says the Wm. was
the entire cause of his Com-
plaints. And if it were not
for the Wm. probably I
should not have noticed any
thing else.

I am now surprised to
hear that he has made
a report to Lords Committee
of several deficiencies which
he says should have been
supplied the vessel, in order
to obtain the 10 year class

If you will allow me
I will now name the things
complained of by Wm. McKenzie

as they appear in his letter
of the 22 Nov.

He says the "smack" came
in here yesterday, good weather
with the "cheeks" of her boom broken
outside the bands.

All I have to say with
reference to the boom" this may
have happened the very next
day after leaving the builder
but this vessel has left me
nearly to mos

cleats for the Halyards" he
says in consequence of being
too slight and the spikes
too small fastening them
they were carried away
this he attributes to the

want of supervision of the
Foreman... This may
have been the case but I have
no doubt he considered it
sufficiently secured also
the Captain or he may have
aid so at the time.

Greenails". The proper number
from the Stm and many
prevented bolts wanting
I have questioned the Foreman
with regard to this matter and
his opinion is that there
was sufficient number from
the planking inside as well
as prevented bolts.

3
Nail heads not putted along
the stem & stern post.

3 I really don't know if this
was omitted, all I can
say it was not intentional
as Mr. Efferns could not
have been the consideration

4 Breast Hooks Mr. W. Penzie
says no breast hooks forward
I say to say that there was
one breast hook below the
deck and a slight one
at the rail across the stem
I believe Mr. W. Penzie suggested
to the Foreman when he
was here to have another
below back at the time
it was considered not necessary

5 Store" in fore castle he
Complains was fixed
in such a way as to
burn the Paul bits. I have
only to say to this considering the
small space which a little
vessel of her size has in
the fore castle, it was fixed
to give ~~as~~ the most convenient
loom.

6 Lights, "No place to keep them"
in when not used.

As there was not much room in
the Cabin or fore castle probably
it was not considered necessary
besides it was not asked for
by any one or else no
doubt some place would
have been made if necessary.

Must" he says to crown the
whole has been condemned
by every body, and I must
have it out of her being
too small and too short.

All I have to say with reference
to the length of the mast. I consider
it quite long enough for her and
for her Capacity. She was
built with clean ends and
sharps by his instructions. I
myself did not over mist
her. And the mast being
of pitch pine I consider
it quite heavy enough
for her.

© 2021
Lloyd's Register
Foundation

Very much to hear
his report and to
prevent any further
unpleasances I would
be quite willing to make
good any reasonable
deficiencies

I am Sir
Yours truly
A. D. Warren

P. S.

I may say there is some 10 or 13
gown in the hands of McPenny's
besides money advanced to his
Captain also money paid for Beef
Provisions &c for the double voyage