

HI/MT

22nd July 1936.

Messrs Parker Garrett & Co.
St Michael's Rectory,
CORNHILL. London. E.C. 3.

Dear Sirs,

"JOSEPH B. MEDILL".

This Inquiry was concluded to-day and Judgment is to be delivered on Wednesday the 29th inst. at 10-30 a.m.

x We enclose you a list of the Questions which the Board of Trade here submitted to the Court.

We may say at once that no points arose which involved your clients in any way and the loss of the ship will always remain a mystery. To our mind the fact of this vessel being a welded ship in no way contributed to her loss and it would seem that a welded ship is even stronger than a rivetted one.

Mr. Ross addressed the Court on behalf of the Seamen's Union on Questions 19, 20, and 26 and Mr Bateson answered his remarks very efficiently for the Board of Trade.

We rather think the finding of the Court will be that the vessel did run into an iceberg and so caused her loss.

The evidence adduced to the Court to-day was:-

1. Thomas Tinnmouth a Tyne Pilot when she underwent her trials on the 10th August off Hartley when she steered well wind force 4. She was put through turning tests when she was found to be easy to catch when on the swing. Hand gear was given half circles and found satisfactory. Her draft was 13.9 aft when she underwent these.

W475-0057

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

22/7/36.

2. George Daniel a Board of Trade Surveyor said he surveyed the vessel when building after she had been launched, until July. He was satisfied with everything including workmanship. He watched the welding. He measured the vessel for her freeboard - 9' 0" assigned - sighted the keel - took 9 sights; only one of them was a little out at a point some 40 ft. from the end of the keel about 1-32nd part, which would not diminish her strength. He took the measurements for granting a Certificate for the vessel to proceed to Montreal and he surveyed the vessel in dry dock with her cargo on board before she sailed and she was properly placed on the blocks and shored and could not have sustained any damage therefrom.
3. Mr. Harris, Principal Surveyor for the Board of Trade, Newcastle, spoke to visiting the ship and issuing Life Saving Certificates and what they consisted of; he inspected the hatch locking arrangement and saw it fitted properly. - He also inspected the ventilators and saw the ship after the alterations had been made to her stern. He saw the vessel on the blocks which gave adequate support and inspected the bottom plates which were good.
4. Your Surveyor, Mr. Arkester, was the next witness. - He produced his Survey Report which gave the name & particulars of the vessel and approving of the plans for the service in question. He also spoke to the welding of the ship being good. He recommended the classification as star A.1. on an extreme draft of 14 ft.
5. Thomas William Rivens Principal Surveyor for the Board of Trade said that in May 1935 the Builders applied for a loadline. He calculated the scantlings which were sufficient for a draft of 15 ft.
6. Alexander Roger Riddle was called and spoke to surveying the machinery.
7. William Graham was called and spoke to being

W475-0051

responsible for the exemption for Wireless and in granting same the voyage was considered.

8. James John Bailey Senior Naval Surveyor at Leith attended the trial on the 3rd August and spoke to the vessel steering badly.

9. John Robson, Ship Surveyor, boarded the vessel on the 10th August and went out with her to see whether the water ballast was pumped out and the vessel brought down to her disc, which was done.

10. Mr. Fleming a Director of Arthur Stott & Co. gave the name of the Charterers of the vessel as The Mills Exportation Trade Co. Ltd.

11. James John Pollock Shipbroker at Grangemouth gave particulars as to the loading of the cargo and as to each truck being weighed before the contents were loaded into the vessel and to the tare of the truck being taken afterwards and that the weighing was done by an official weigher of the L.N.E.R. Co.

12. James Allan was engaged in loading the coals at Grangemouth and spoke to Anthracite coal running more freely than ordinary coal, and he saw the cargo loaded which was in dry weather and the ship was trimmed by his firm. He spoke as to No. 3 hold being first loaded with 300 tons then No. 1 hold with a similar quantity and No. 2 hold was similarly filled. He stated that no trimming was done in No. 1 hold and No. 3 was all level. His partner, William Hogg, was also called as to the trimming.

Four trimmers were also called and detailed what they did in the way of trimming.

William Graham a Foreman Stevedore at Grangemouth spoke to stowing two boats in No. 1 hold after the coal was

Messrs Parker Garrett & Co.

-4-

22/7/36.

loaded which were not chocked or secured but were slid over the coal.

4
Lastly Mr Watt was called to explain/^{when}the word "experimental" was dropped in the description of the vessel and the words "Electric welding" substituted, in the Register.

Yours faithfully,

INGLEDEW & CO.



© 2019

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

W475-0057

414