

Reference

15

LLOYD'S REGISTER  
LONDON.

REC'D 27 JAN. 1904

ANSR

Lloyd's Register of British  
and Foreign Shipping.  
Butte Docks Cardiff.26<sup>th</sup> January 1904

The Secretary

Sir

In reply to your letter of the 25<sup>th</sup> inst relating to the Bk. "Eurydice"; I beg to inform you that I joined Mr. Westcott on the survey of this vessel on the 15<sup>th</sup> inst, in accordance with instructions contained in your letter N. 7/12/03.

On examining vessel, in the Hold above close ceiling it was found that a large number of shell rivets in the frames had their heads off, and in one space on port side aft, the rivets were broken between the frame and the shell. It was noticed that where the defective rivets were, there was oxidation between the frame and the shell which was no doubt breaking the rivets.

The defective rivets were distributed at various parts of the Hold and between the Hold Beam Stringer and the ceiling; as there

© 2021  
Lloyd's Register  
Foundation  
W354B4-0023 1/4



was scarcely a frame in vessel which did not shew more or less of having rust at the back at places between the Hold Beam stringer and cement, it was recommended that the frames in the Hold be unriveted from the Hold Beam stringer to the cement for the removal of the oxidation.

Mr. Sutherland however agreed to unrivet a portion to see what extent the oxidation was at the back before he decided to carry out this recommendation, and three frames at each end and three amidships were marked promisciously for unriveting.

Mr. Sutherland had these frames unriveted from side stringer to ceiling, and on the 22<sup>nd</sup> inst. I again visited this vessel and examined the unriveted frames, and it was found that the after frames had a thick layer of hard oxidation at the back of the frames, and those forward and amidships had oxidation at places at the back, but not so thick as those at the after end. We then informed Mr. Sutherland



that we could not alter our previous recommendation <sup>made</sup> on the 15<sup>th</sup> inst; at the same time if he could point out to us any frame which undoubtedly showed no signs of having oxidation at the back we should not ask him to unrig it.

With regard to the indented plate in flat of bottom which Mr. Sutherland declines to remove, I may mention that this indent has been recently done; it is set up about one inch in a frame space and although no signs of fracture could be seen it is a very severe nip near the edge of the frame, and for a thick iron plate the material must be severely distressed, which would be brought to view if the plate was taken off and heated for fairing.

The wasted plates on port side in way of fore-castle which Mr. Sutherland objects to renew; these plates showed fully 25% of depreciation at edge of frame and if Mr. Sutherland has had the plates drilled



I doubt if the drilling has been made at the worst part, and that the thickness he has given is of the plates in the sheerstrake and not the strake below. I might mention that the plates were scored so badly with deterioration at the edge of the frames that I did not ask for them to be drilled.

With regards to the repairs to the main mast, I am of opinion that an efficient job could not be made of the mast in its place; the plating being completely wasted through at the heel; the chain locker of the vessel is in way of this mast and the lower part of the mast had been filled with solid cement.

I regret that Mr. Sutherland <sup>declines</sup> ~~declines~~ to carry out the recommendations that have been made as in my opinion the same are necessary for carrying out the Special Survey &c.

Mr. Sutherland's letter and the copy of our letter to him are returned herewith.

Yours sincerely,  
J. H. Sutherland

W354B4.0023 4/4 H. H. and

© 2021

Lloyd's Register  
Foundation



*Referred to the Chief Ship Surveyor:*

*ad*

27. JAN. 1904

*Also for Mr. Hill to note*



© 2021

Lloyd's Register  
Foundation