

W. Anderson, A.B.
 John J. Corteen, A.B.
 Austin Berry, Chief Engineer.
 James Oliver, Second Engineer.
 Thomas Hornby, Third Engineer.
 H. J. Berry, Fourth Engineer.
 William Myler, Donkeyman.
 William Harrison, Fireman.
 Patrick McGrath, Fireman.
 George Kirkbride, Fireman.
 Arthur Sage, Engineer's Steward.
 Edward Pratt, Steward.
 J. Harrington, Fireman.
 A. Jobiasen, A.B.
 Thomas Burke, Fireman.

On the conclusion of the evidence, Mr. Burton, on behalf of the Board of Trade, submitted the following questions for the opinion of the Court:—

(1.) Was the vessel, when she left Mobile, Alabama, on the 27th December, 1900, in good and seaworthy condition as regards hull and equipments, and was she supplied with the boats and life saving appliances required by the statute?

(2.) What was the number and rating of the vessel's crew?

(3.) What cargo did the vessel carry, and was it properly stowed?

(4.) Was the vessel overladen? What deck cargo did she carry? Was it too heavy for her; was the weight of it properly distributed and was it efficiently secured?

(5.) As laden had the vessel sufficient stability?

(6.) Was the vessel in proper trim and in seaworthy condition when she left Fort Morgan on the 28th December, 1900?

(7.) What, in the opinion of the Court, is the cause of the vessel not having been heard of since the pilot left her on the 28th December, 1900?

Mr. Wallace, having addressed the Court on behalf of the owners, and Mr. Burton having replied on behalf of the Board of Trade, the Court replied to the questions as follows:—

(1.) The "Mobile," when she left Mobile, Alabama, on the 27th day of December, 1900, was in good and seaworthy condition as regards hull and equipments, and she was supplied with the boats and life-saving appliances required by the statute.

(2.) Her crew was comprised of the master, three mates, four engineers, seven able seamen, seven firemen, one donkeyman, and three stewards, making a total of twenty-six.

(3.) Her cargo, according to the deposition of Mr. John Walsh, stevedore, of Mobile, and sworn to before

A. S. Benn, Esquire, British Vice-Consul at Mobile, consisted of 6,287 bales of cotton, 4,480 sacks of cotton seed meal, 25,820 bushels of grain in bulk, 2,400 wooden staves, 650,491 superficial feet of pitch pine and poplar timber, and 32,395 cubic feet of pitch pine timber, and was stowed, according to a rough drawing made by him, as follows:—On deck, between the forecabin and forepart of bridge deck and between the afterpart of bridge deck and poop, pitch pine timber; in the poop and bridge deck house, cotton in bales; in the hold in forepeak cotton in bales; in No. 1 hold cotton seed meal in bags at the bottom, on them lumber which consisted of planks, deals and boards from 1×6 to 4×12, above them and up to the deck cotton in bales; in Nos. 2 and 3 holds, grain in bulk at the bottom, on it lumber and cotton in bales as in No. 1 hold; in No. 4 hold, lumber at the bottom and cotton in bales up to the deck.

(4.) The Court is of opinion that, considering the draft and freeboard of the "Mobile," and the dead-weight of the cargo, she was not overladen. She carried a deck cargo of pitch pine timber, the weight being estimated at about 700 tons, as well as the poop and bridge deck house being filled with bales of cotton. This the Court considers being too heavy for her. The only evidence as to its being properly distributed and efficiently secured is the deposition of Mr. Walsh, stevedore at Mobile, Alabama, that it was 6 to 7 feet above the deck and was secured with stanchions, chains and wire lashings under the supervision of the master.

(5.) The Court is of opinion that when the "Mobile" left Fort Morgan, as laden with her deck cargo, she had not sufficient stability to cross the Atlantic in the winter months.

(6.) The Court considers that the "Mobile" was not in proper trim or seaworthy condition when she left Fort Morgan.

(7.) The "Mobile" possibly encountered bad weather, and owing to her heavy deck cargo affecting her stability, probably foundered.

J. SUGGITT, } Justices.
 ROBT. LAUDER, }

We concur.

HENRY KNOX, } Assessors.
 Captain R.N., }
 E. M. HUGHES, }

(Issued in London by the Board of Trade on the 16th day of July, 1901.)

(N

"RAT

The Merchant

IN the matter of a for
 Land Commission C
 the 30th and 31st
 days of August, 19
 assisted by Captain
 SAMUEL BROOKS, in
 the loss of the Brit
 of Dublin, which le
 about the 2nd Octol
 heard of.

Rep

The Court having car
 stances attending the ab
 finds for the reasons sta
 ship was lost by the per
 good and seaworthy co
 equipments and was p
 and trimmed when she
 day of October, 1900.
 evidence bearing upon
 any other conclusion
 having been heard of si

Dated this 2nd

We concur in the ab

Am

This inquiry was he
 Four Courts, Dublin
 police magistrate, ass
 Captain S. Brooks, na
 Mr. Keith Hallowe
 and Hamilton), appe
 Mr. William Hayes, s
 The "Rathdown,"
 was a British sailin
 Workman, Clarke & C
 She was ship-rigg
 following dimension
 41·7 ft.; depth of h
 midships, 24·45 ft.
 2,058·31.

She was owned b
 others, Sir Richard
 Rogerson's Quay, I
 owner, advice under
 registered owners,
 classed 100 A1 at L
 all life-saving applia
 had four boats, two
 gig. The lifeboats
 between the main ar
 the forward deck-h
 was placed on skids
 fitted with every n
 statute.

She had four co
 Thomson, a steerin
 spare compass, an
 These were all in g
 New York in March
 She had a forec
 high; a poop deck

9774—180—8/19