

THE "LISMORE" INQUIRY.

Expert and the Cause of Loss

SOLE SURVIVOR RECALLED.

From Our Own Correspondent.

DUBLIN, Monday.

Mr. Geo. P. Cussen, district justice, assisted by Captain J. H. Webb and Captain Louis Brady, master mariners, Mr. F. G. Miller, marine engineer, and Mr. W. J. Mares, naval architect, resumed the inquiry to-day into the loss of the steamer *Lismore*, which foundered 16 miles off the Hook Head, County Wexford, on July 10 last.

Mr. E. A. Swayne, K.C., and Mr. Costello (instructed by the Chief State Solicitor) appeared for the Department of Industry and Commerce; Mr. A. K. Overend, K.C. (instructed by Messrs. D. & T. Fitzgerald) appeared for the owners.

WILLIAM KINGSTON, employed at Henry Ford & Sons, Cork, gave evidence of having seen the *Lismore* passing down the River Lee on the evening of July 10. When opposite Monkstown, she had a list of 5 deg. to port. He could see the vessel a quarter of a mile away, and she was coming end-on towards him.

JOHN MOORE, a cattle drover, stated that when the first batch of cattle were put on board the ship, she took a list to port, and when she left on the voyage she still had a list to the same side.

THE LIST.

MICHAEL GRIFFIN, a crane-man, at the G. S. and W. Railway Company, Cork, stated that when he saw the *Lismore* going down the river she had a list to port, and he remarked to the man who was working with him that she might settle down when she got out to sea.

JOHN CARLEY, the sole survivor of the *Lismore*, recalled by Mr. Swayne, stated that he did not think the *Lismore* had to be put hard over when the vessel left Penrose Quay, because she was an easy vessel to handle. He was called to his watch on the night in question by a man named Watson, who told him he was going down to clean the scuppers.

COUNSEL: Did you notice when you got on deck the vessel had a greater list than she had previously?—Yes, undoubtedly.

Continuing, WITNESS said that he did not know when the vessel had left Penrose Quay that her course was altered. She did not turn at any time towards land, and he did not notice any water coming in on the starboard side.

COUNSEL: When you were called did you hear anything?—I heard the telegraph going and a noise of breaking before she went over.

Replying to Mr. Overend, WITNESS contradicted the copy of the ship's log as to the time the ship came to the quay in Cork.

Answering Mr. Cussen, he stated that he was very much alarmed when he was called that night and saw the list that the ship had.

COUNSEL: Did you wonder, when you saw the state of the ship, that you were not

called much earlier?—I certainly did, when I came on deck and saw how the ship was.

Asked his opinion as to why all the hands had not been called on deck at an earlier hour, WITNESS replied: Well, sir, I do not think the captain had been on deck during the watch. If he had, a man of so many years' experience would naturally have called all the men above.

Mr. R. W. SINNOTT, general manager of the Cork Steam Packet Company, stated that he saw the *Lismore* at Penrose Quay at 11 o'clock on July 10, and Mr. T. McINTYRE, assistant general manager of the company, gave corroborative evidence.

MICHAEL MURPHY, watchman, in the employment of the owners, stated that he went on board the vessel at Ford's Wharf at 8 o'clock on the morning of July 10, and at 10 o'clock they left the wharf and went up to Penrose Quay. There they arrived about 10 30, and were discharging cargo until 12 o'clock.

Mr. CUSSEN intimated that unless Mr. Swayne had further witnesses to call regarding the time the *Lismore* came to Penrose Quay on the morning of July 10, the Court had heard sufficient evidence to enable them to make up their minds.

QUESTION OF STABILITY.

Mr. DAVID FREE, naval architect, employed by the Ardrossan Shipbuilding Company, gave evidence of having prepared the plans of the *Lismore*.

Replying to Mr. Swayne, WITNESS said that the increased draught would not improve the vessel's stability. Asked as to whether there were any special features in the vessel, he said it was not advisable to have a vessel much too stiff in a sea way. An easier roll was desirable for cattle.

COUNSEL: Assuming that the vessel had these lists of which evidence has been given, and that the Court came to that conclusion, what do you say, as an expert, would have accounted for the list? Would it be due to loading?—It might be due to distribution.

Replying to Mr. Swayne, WITNESS said that he never contemplated that the cargo would be put on the fore-castle and boat decks.

Can you say, as an expert, what in your opinion is the probable cause of this disaster, using your best judgment in the matter?

Mr. OVEREND objected, unless he had an opportunity of asking witness a few questions first. In any event the question was one for the Courts.

Mr. CUSSEN said that the Court would suggest that the witness should give the diagrammatic summary of weights, and that to-morrow he might give an answer to (1) whether on account of the distribution of the weights it brought about the list? (2) Would that have accounted for the increasing list? and (3) would it be the cause of the ship's ultimate disaster?

WITNESS said that he could not reply to these questions thoroughly. They were too much for him, and he could not answer. He would, however, endeavour to work out the matter.

Answering Mr. Overend, WITNESS said it was a common practice to put cargo on the fore-castle poops and bridge decks.

The inquiry was adjourned.



© 2021

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

W709-0098