

(No. 6844.)

“CHEANG CHEW” (S.S.).

MARINE Court of Inquiry into the stranding of the s.s. “CHEANG CHEW” on Mud Spit, off Tanjong Bulus, on the 22nd day of June, 1905.

*Report of Court.*

In the matter of an inquiry held at the Marine Police Court, Singapore, on the 8th day of July, 1905, before E. C. Howard, Acting First Magistrate, assisted by Captain A. H. Boldero, Retired Royal Navy, Master Attendant, Straits Settlements; R. H. Dunmall, master mariner; and A. A. Fyfe, master mariner; into the circumstances attending the afore-mentioned shipping casualty, the Court finds, for the reason stated in the Annex hereto, that the occurrence was due to the negligence of the captain, John Harrison, and orders that he pay the costs of this inquiry.

Dated this 8th day of July, 1905.

E. C. HOWARD,  
President.

We concur in the above Report.

R. H. DUNMALL, }  
A. H. BOLDERO, } Assessors.  
A. A. FYFE, }

*Annex to the Report.*

The s.s. “Cheang Chew, of Singapore, official number 63304, left Singapore at 10.30 p.m. on the 21st day of June, 1905, for Penang with a crew of 78, eight passengers, and a cargo of wood. All went well till 1.15 a.m. on the morning of the 22nd, when the vessel stranded on Mud Spit, off Tanjong Bulus, where she remained fast for nine days, but sustained no damage. In rounding Raffles light, at midnight, previous to the casualty, the captain did not set a course direct for Tanjong Bulus, but one “N. 62° W.” to the neighbourhood of Sultan Shoal light, until that light bore “N. 33° E.” He says he did this in order to give a wide berth to One Tree shoal, and that the course followed is his usual course, though it would seem from the old pencil lines on his chart that this is not the case. The chart is in such a condition that it is difficult to say definitely from it what was the actual course followed on this occasion. The captain says that he took four-point bearings when off the Sultan shoal. This is not corroborated by the chart, nor is his further statement that he took cross bearings of Sultan shoal and Raffles lights. From this point a course was set “N. 83° W.” true. The captain then went down to have a smoke, leaving the boatswain in charge of the bridge, a man without any local experience, who had been engaged in Hongkong. The weather was hazy at the time. It was full tide.

Having regard to the above circumstances the Court is of opinion that the casualty was caused by the unsafe course set at 12.30 a.m. on the morning of the 22nd, off Sultan shoal, and by the fact that the exact position of the vessel at that moment was not determined with sufficient care and accuracy.

The Court considers that the conduct of the captain, John Harrison, was reprehensible in these particulars. As, however, no serious damage was sustained, the Court is unable to deal with the master's certificate, but orders him to pay the costs of the inquiry.

E. C. HOWARD,  
A. H. BOLDERO,  
R. H. DUNMALL,  
A. A. FYFE.

(Issued in London by the Board of Trade on the 8th day of September, 1905.)