

(No. S. 240.)

"QUAIL" (S.S.)

AND

"DYNAMO" (S.S.).

The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.

IN the matter of a Formal Investigation held at the Town Hall, Hull, on the 26th, 27th, 28th, and 30th days of September, and the 1st and 2nd days of October, 1907, before J. G. HAY HALKETT, Esquire, assisted by Captain A. WOOD, Captain COWIE, and Mr. J. REED, into the circumstances attending the running down and sinking of the s.s. "QUAIL," whilst at anchor in the river Humber by the s.s. "DYNAMO," on the 20th day of August last, whereby loss of life ensued.

Report of Court.

The Court having carefully inquired into the circumstances attending the above-mentioned shipping casualty, finds for the reasons stated in the annex hereto, that the collision and loss of life were caused by (i) the "Quail" being anchored in the middle of a particularly dangerous part of the fairway (ii) Her lights being rendered difficult of identification, owing to the bright lights at the new Immingham Dock works (iii) The absence of a vigilant lookout on board the "Dynamo."

The conduct of the skipper of the "Quail," who unfortunately lost his life at the casualty, is not within the scope of the inquiry, and no blame attaches to the second hand of that vessel.

The Court finds Mr. Tom Mossop Clifford, the master of the "Dynamo"—who is the only party to the inquiry belonging to that vessel—in default, but under the peculiar circumstances of the case it refrains from dealing with his certificate. It, however, strongly impresses upon him the necessity of being more careful in future.

Dated this Second day of October, 1907.

J. G. HAY HALKETT,
Judge.

We concur in the above Report.

A. WOOD,
W. COWIE, } Assessors.
JOHN REED, }

Annex to the Report.

This inquiry was held at the Town Hall, Hull, on the above-mentioned days, when Mr. H. Saxelbye appeared for the Board of Trade, Mr. A. M. Jackson for William Henry Willey, the second hand of the "Quail," and Mr. A. T. Miller for the master of the "Dynamo." Mr. T. W. Hearfield watched the case on behalf of the owners and underwriters of the "Dynamo," and Mr. F. C. Payne on behalf of the widow of the late Mr. William Lewis, skipper of the "Quail."

The "Quail," official number 108531, was a British screw steam trawler, built of iron, at North Shields, in 1897, by Messrs. Edwards Bros., and her respective

dimensions were:—Length 106 feet, breadth 20·6 feet, depth in hold 11 feet, gross tonnage 143·78 tons, and registered tonnage 42·37 tons. She was fitted, by the North Eastern Marine Engineering Co., Ltd., Sunderland, with triple expansion engines of 41 h.p. nominal, the diameter of her cylinders being 12 ins., 18 ins., and 30 ins. respectively. Her speed is given in the register as 10½ knots. She was owned by Messrs. Kelsall Bros. & Beeching, Ltd., Mr. John Edmond Ambrose Kelsall and Mr. George Beeching, both of Fleetwood, being her registered joint-managers. She had one boat of the usual size and description carried by vessels of her class and two life buoys in racks on the bridge. The second hand stated that she had also five life jackets, but these were all he had seen, and there may have been others on board which he had not seen. The vessel was otherwise well fitted and found in every respect.

The "Quail" left Hull at about 1.50 p.m. of the 19th August last with a crew of nine hands all told, under the command of the late Mr. William Lewis, bound for the Gamecock Fleet in the North Sea. The weather was then fine and clear, and a strong breeze was blowing from the west. As she proceeded down the river she, from some wholly unexplained cause, got considerably to the eastward of her proper course, and, at about 40 minutes after leaving Hull, she ran aground on the Foul Holme sand immediately opposite the Killingholme lighthouses. She remained aground until about 1.30 a.m. of the 20th during which time the wind fined down to a light breeze. When darkness came on two bright lights were exhibited, one on the fore topmast stay forward (hung up by hand from the deck), and one on the port mizen rigging about 2 feet higher than the first—instead of double the height. There was some discrepancy in the evidence as to what was necessary to be done in the way of clearing up the decks and disposing of the ship's stores before she went to sea, and also what, in fact, the crew did during the time the vessel was on the sand. One or two of the witnesses stated that little was done during the time, but, even if so, there was nothing in the condition of the vessel or stores to prevent her proceeding to sea when she floated. However, when she was got off the sand, the skipper instead of proceeding to sea, steamed out into the channel under the two bright lights already mentioned, but without exhibiting any side lights, and dropped his anchor in a position with the Killingholme lights in line bearing N.W. ½ W., distant about 1½ miles, and Newsham Booth high light, bearing S.W. by S., distant ½ mile.

She anchored in her new position, which was right in the middle of the fairway, and in a particularly dangerous part of it. After her anchor was let go, the second hand shifted the light on the port mizen rigging to its proper height, viz., double that of the other light, as provided by Humber Trinity House Rule No. 2. At about 2.40 a.m. an anchor watch was set. The first watch was taken by John William Dilbo, the deck hand (a lad of 16) who was relieved shortly before the casualty by the late James Nicolini, the third hand. The wind had by this time completely dropped, and the night was fine and clear.

At about 3.0 a.m., those on board the "Quail" were awakened by the crash of a collision. No warning had been given them by the third hand, who was alone on the deck. All hands succeeded in getting up from below, except the skipper and second hand, although the chief engineer experienced great difficulty in making his escape from the cabin, which immediately began to fill with water. When the men reached the deck, they discovered that a steamship, which subsequently proved to be the "Dynamo," had collided with their starboard quarter, cutting into the deck some two feet in the way of the skipper's berth.

The "Dynamo," official number 88169, is a British screw steamship built of steel, at Hull, in 1884, by Earles Company, Limited, and her respective dimensions are:—Length 175·7 ft., breadth 25 ft., depth of hold 13·8 ft., gross tonnage 503·78 tons, and registered tonnage 311·19 tons. She was fitted by her builders with triple expansion engines of 110 h.p.

nominal, the diameter of the cylinders being 17 ins., 27 ins., and 48 ins. respectively, and length of stroke 27 ins. She is owned by Wilsons and North Eastern Railway Shipping Company, Ltd., Mr. William Joseph Tarn, of Commercial Road, Hull, being her registered manager. She had three boats—two life boats and one jolly boat—6 life buoys and 14 life jackets. She was well fitted and found in all respects. She is engaged in trading between Antwerp and Hull, and, on the voyage in question, she was laden with 500 tons general cargo, her draught being about 10 ft. 6 ins. forward, and 15 ft. aft.

The "Dynamo" left Hull at about 2.0 a.m. of the 20th August last, under the command of Mr. Tom Mossop Clifford, who holds a certificate as ordinary master, No. 012790, and dated the 29th September, 1888. The master also possesses a Humber Pilotage certificate. The crew consisted of 14 hands all told, and there were 4 deck passengers on board. When she left Hull her regulation lights were duly exhibited and burning brightly, and she proceeded down the river at full speed, which was 10½ to 11 knots through the water. High water at Hull on this morning, was, according to the tide table, at 2.41 a.m. The weather on the way down the river was fine and clear, the wind being very light from the westward. The master was on the lower bridge in charge of the vessel, and with him were the second officer and an A.B. at the wheel. The chief officer was on the fore-castle head keeping a look-out. At the gas buoy opposite Paull, the vessel was put on a course of S. ½ E., which is the standard course for Newsham Booth light. The man at the wheel stated that he kept that light slightly on his port bow, and thus the vessel was somewhat to the starboard side of mid-channel.

In the proximity of the Newsham Booth light are very extensive works in connection with the construction of the new Immingham Dock. The works extend along the Lincolnshire bank of the Humber for nearly a mile—the Newsham Booth light being considerably to the northward and westward of the centre of them. Four temporary piers in connection with the works extend into the river beyond low water mark. These piers, and vessels lying at them, are lighted up with ordinary lights, whilst two other vessels engaged in dredging, one of which lies alongside the piers, and the other shifts its position are illuminated with powerful electric lights. It was stated that in January last representations were made by several masters of vessels that the blaze of light exhibited from these works made it difficult for them to recognize Killingholme lights when coming up the Humber, or Newsham Booth lights when going down. In this case this particular difficulty did not arise as the "Dynamo" made the Newsham Booth light satisfactorily.

After the S. ½ E. course had been continued until Killingholme light was about abeam on the starboard side, the master commenced starboarding in order, by an easy curve, to get from that course to the course down channel from Killingholme, which was S.E. ½ E. In order to get on this course, and to bring Killingholme lights, which lead down the centre of the channel, in one, his attention was mainly directed to these lights astern. In the meantime it is not easy to say what was the exact state of affairs on the fore-castle head. During the time which elapsed from Killingholme being abeam to the casualty, a most unintelligent A.B.—Richard Thomas Kingdom—relieved the chief officer on the fore-castle head. The evidence as to when the change took place was far from clear. According to Kingdom, he no sooner had come on the fore-castle head, than he saw the "Quail" and reported her just before the casualty. The "Dynamo" was about one mile distant from the "Quail" when she began to alter her course. The lights of the "Quail" would then be projected among the blaze of lights on the new dock works, but for some two or three minutes before the collision, the "Quail's" lights must have been open to the eastward of these lights. As the "Dynamo" was just steadying on to the S.E. ½ E. course, the "Quail" was first observed ahead about two ships lengths off. At this time the easternmost lights on the construction works would bear about two and a half points on the starboard bow of the "Dynamo." The then position of the "Quail" as seen from the

"Dynamo" was thus against a dark back ground and not confused with any other lights. However, those on board the "Dynamo" (except the master, who said he saw two dim lights), stated that they saw no lights on the "Quail" until the vessels were in collision, although they admitted that after the collision they noticed that her lights were exhibited and burning brightly.

There is no doubt but that the lights on board the "Quail" were duly exhibited, but as the aftermost light of the two was placed close up under the eyes of the port rigging, and as the "Dynamo" approached her from the starboard side as she lay thwart the channel, it is possible that this light may for some time have been obscured by the mast or funnel. There was, however, no obstruction to prevent the light on the foretopmast stay from being seen, and this light should have been seen from the "Dynamo" had a good lookout been kept. The Court finds that a good lookout was not kept on this vessel. Both the master and second officer were keeping a lookout on the lower bridge, but the attention of the master was necessarily directed astern in order to bring the leading lights for the channel in line. No one was on the flying bridge. The master stated that there was no compass on this bridge and that in order to efficiently navigate his vessel he required to be where the man was steering and beside the compass. He said that though the lower bridge was on a level with the fore-castle head he could see quite well forward, and that the flying bridge was only used in entering dock and shifting his vessel whilst there. The probable explanation why the lights of the "Quail" were not generally noticed before the collision is that until within two or three minutes previous to it the lights of the "Quail" were mixed up with the lights on the new dock construction works, and that when the hull of the vessel appeared the attention of those on board the "Dynamo" was concentrated upon it and they did not think about the lights until after the casualty. The "Quail" was first observed from the bridge of the "Dynamo" at the same moment as she was reported from the fore-castle head. At that time the vessels must have been exceedingly close to each other and not separated by an interval of two or three minutes. When the "Quail" was seen the "Dynamo" was still under the influence of the starboard helm. Accordingly the master put the helm hard-a-starboard and the engines full speed astern, but before the way was off the vessel the collision took place. The A.B. on the fore-castle head of the "Dynamo" stated that immediately before the casualty some one on board the "Quail"—presumably James Nicolini, the third hand, who was on the anchor watch—hailed the "Dynamo" and asked, "Where are you coming to?" The same witness stated that the master of the "Dynamo" replied, "I am going full speed astern and the helm is hard-a-starboard."

After the collision the two vessels remained for some moments in contact, and all those on the "Quail"—except the skipper and second hand, who were imprisoned in the cabin, and the third hand—made their way on board the "Dynamo" by means of the ladder of the latter and up the ship's side. The third hand was seen hanging on to the starboard cable of the "Dynamo," and although an attempt was made to rescue him he fell into the water and was not again seen. Soon after the impact the vessels parted, but the "Dynamo" was so manoeuvred as to keep her in close proximity to the sinking vessel. A boat manned from the crews of both vessels, and in charge of the chief officer of the "Dynamo," was then lowered, and proceeded to the "Quail," which was sinking fast. On going on board, the cook of the "Quail," who formed one of the boat's crew, heard cries proceeding from the cabin skylight. It was found that the second hand had failed to open the cabin door through the pressure of water on the inside, and was penned there standing on the cabin table, with his head in the skylight, while his body was immersed in the water which reached almost up to the deck. The skylight was of iron or steel and was not constructed to open, but there were bull's eye lights in the sides and top. A hammer was got from the engine room and the glass in these lights broken in order to communicate freely with the imprisoned man. Unsuccessful attempts were then made to

break open the hand asked opened that could not be of water no impossible to boat then efficient too got back to vessel was exhausted through the "Quail" h then made dived from door, but the skylight dived a sec the top of By this ti the door l pull it op was shot u companion concussion those on d even at t Nothing w skipper of the "Quai to be no d of impact. "Quail" s with the s

It is no the condu his life u there any that vesse for any o the cabin board the party to t not the The Cour dealt wit that his duties wh

The A Humber, marked the second the vess The tru House l given.

At th on beha followin

(1) D anchora last, an anchor l the nav

(2) V bringin was the direct t

(3) I works "Dyna exhibit

(4) V both sh

(5) V life, an those o

(6) V seaman

(7) V life cau of tha

of eith

break open the skylight. In the meantime the second hand asked the cook to try and get the cabin door opened that led to the companion ladder. This door could not be reached by hand owing to the amount of water now before the bulkhead, and it was found impossible to open it by means of a boat hook. The boat then returned to the "Dynamo" for more efficient tools for breaking the skylight. When she got back to the "Quail" the second hand of this vessel was found on the deck forward in a very exhausted condition. It appears that when he saw through the skylight that the boat had left the "Quail" he imagined that he was abandoned. He then made desperate efforts to extricate himself. He dived from his then position in order to get at the door, but failed, and came up to the surface under the skylight in order to recover his breath. He then dived a second time and succeeded in getting hold of the top of the door, which he found slightly open. By this time the pressure of water on each side of the door had become equalised, and he managed to pull it open. He got himself through the doorway, was shot up to the surface and scrambled out by the companion. He was considerably injured by the concussion of the blows on the skylight delivered by those on deck in their attempts to break it open, and even at the inquiry had not completely recovered. Nothing was seen or heard of Mr. William Lewis, the skipper of the "Quail." The "Dynamo" cut into the "Quail" in the way of his berth, and there seems to be no doubt but that he was killed at the moment of impact. About half an hour after the casualty the "Quail" sank and the "Dynamo" returned to Hull with the seven survivors on board.

It is not for the Court to express an opinion as to the conduct of the skipper of the "Quail," who lost his life under such tragic circumstances. Nor was there anything in the behaviour of the second hand of that vessel up to the time of the casualty which calls for any observation. His strenuous fight for life in the cabin has already been alluded to. Of those on board the "Dynamo" only one, viz., the master, was a party to this inquiry, although he was unquestionably not the only person to blame for the bad look out. The Court would, however, have felt bound to have dealt with his certificate had it not been for the fact that his attention was necessarily directed to other duties when the "Quail" ought to have been sighted. The Admiralty chart "entrance to the River Humber," which was produced in Court, has been marked 2 in red ink. This was stated on behalf of the second hand of the "Quail" to be the position of the vessel. This position however is inaccurate. The true position is indicated by a Hull Trinity House Notice to Mariners, and has already been given.

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

- (1) Did the "Quail" take up a safe and proper anchorage at or about 1.25 a.m. on the 20th August last, and did she then and thereafter exhibit the anchor lights required by rule 2 of the rules made for the navigation of the River Humber?
- (2) Was the skipper of the "Quail" justified in bringing his vessel to an anchor at all at this time, or was there anything to have prevented his proceeding direct to sea?
- (3) Did the lights from the new Immingham Dock works at any time prevent those on board the "Dynamo" from seeing and recognizing the lights exhibited by the "Quail"?
- (4) Was a good and proper look out kept on board both ships?
- (5) What was the cause of the collision and loss of life, and was every possible assistance rendered by those on board the "Dynamo"?
- (6) Was the "Dynamo" navigated with proper and seamanlike care?
- (7) Was the loss of the "Quail" and/or the loss of life caused by the wrongful act or default of the mate of that vessel and the master of the "Dynamo," or of either of them?

Mr. Miller having addressed the Court on behalf of the master of the "Dynamo," and Mr. Jackson on behalf of the second hand of the "Quail," the Court gave judgment and returned the following answers to the questions of the Board of Trade:—

(1) The "Quail" did not take up a safe and proper anchorage at or about 1.25 a.m. on the 20th August last. She did exhibit the anchor lights required by rule 2 of the rules made for the navigation of the River Humber.

(2) There was no necessity for the skipper of the "Quail" to bring his vessel to an anchor at all at this time, nor was there anything to have prevented his proceeding direct to sea.

(3) After the "Dynamo," on her course of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ E., passed abeam of the Killingholme lights she began to starboard in order to get round the bend of the channel, and thus gradually on to her new course of S.E. $\frac{1}{2}$ E. The time occupied in making this alteration would be about five minutes. At the moment when the starboarding commenced the lights of the "Quail" would have been directly in line with any lights that may have been exhibited at the easternmost pier of the new Immingham Dock works. During the five minutes of starboarding, the "Quail's" lights would gradually open out to the eastward clear of any of the dock lights, and at the end of that period, viz., just before the collision, when the "Quail" was sighted practically right ahead the most easterly of the dock lights would be about 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ points on the "Dynamo's" starboard bow. Thus, although when the vessel first began to alter her course, and for a considerable time before, the lights from the new Immingham Dock works may have tended to prevent those on board the "Dynamo" from seeing and recognizing the lights exhibited by the "Quail," yet for two or three minutes before the casualty this would not be the case.

(4) A good and proper look out was kept on board the "Quail." A good and proper look out was not kept on board the "Dynamo."

(5) The collision and loss of life were caused by:—
(i) The "Quail" bringing up and remaining anchored in the middle of a particularly dangerous part of the fairway in contravention of rule 8 of the rules made for the navigation of the River Humber (ii) The nature of the "Quail's" lights being rendered difficult of identification owing to the bright electric and other lights at the new Immingham Dock works (iii) The absence of a vigilant look out on board the "Dynamo." Every possible assistance was rendered by those on board the "Dynamo."

(6) The "Dynamo" was not navigated with proper and seamanlike care.

(7) The loss of the "Quail" and the loss of life were not caused by the wrongful act or default of the second hand of that vessel. They were caused to some extent by the default of the master of the "Dynamo," although either the chief officer or the A.B. on the fore-castle head—the evidence is not clear as to who was there when the "Quail's" lights should first have been sighted—was chiefly to blame for the bad look out. It must be conceded that the master was justified in placing confidence in the look out forward especially at such times as he was occupied in looking astern to get the two Killingholme lights in one. This, however, should not have prevented him from distinguishing the "Quail's" lights in time to avert the casualty. Under the peculiar circumstances of the case, however, the Court refrains from dealing with his certificate, but strongly impresses upon him the necessity of being more careful in future.

J. G. HAY HALKETT,
Judge.

We concur.

A. WOOD,
W. COWIE, } Assessors.
JOHN REED, }

(Issued in London by the Board of Trade on the 22nd day of October, 1907.)

flood tide with her. She was on a N.W. $\frac{1}{2}$ N. course; there was a fresh wind from W.N.W. with a short choppy sea. The night was described as clear, but dark, the moon being low in the south west and obscured by clouds.

Before reaching the Bull Lightship the lights which had been reported by the lookout on the fore-castle head were one bright light right ahead, which was the stern light of a steam trawler some distance up the Humber, and a white light $2\frac{1}{2}$ points on the port bow which was the stern light of the barge previously mentioned. When the "Lorenzo" was from a quarter to half a mile inside the Bull, as the pilot was observing the light on the port bow he suddenly saw a black object, which he took to be a sail right ahead, a very short distance in front of the bows of the "Lorenzo." No report as to this object had been made by the lookout. On passing the Bull Light vessel an A.B., Soren Antonsen, was on the look out on the fore-castle head of the "Lorenzo," but shortly before the collision he was relieved by George Carroll, an ordinary seaman, who gave evidence that immediately after taking the lookout he noticed the loom of a vessel about a point on the port bow, and quite close to the ship. He reported it to the bridge. The pilot said he received this report just at the time he himself sighted the object. The pilot at once ordered the helm hard-a-starboard and the engines full speed astern, but before the engines or helm could take any effect the captain, feeling a grating, looked over the starboard side of the bridge and saw what he described as the forepart of a small vessel, partly submerged. He saw no one on board, but when the wreckage passed clear he heard a shout, but could not tell what it was, and thought it came from a vessel near.

Three blasts on the whistle were blown, this being the ship's signal for boats, and the starboard cutter, fully manned, was promptly lowered near to the water. A lifebuoy with Holmes' Light was also thrown overboard, but this did not ignite. It is to be regretted that other buoys with Holmes' Lights were not thrown overboard. The boat was not put into the water on account of the speed of the ship, and the pilot and master, after consideration of the matter, decided it would be better to bring the ship herself back to the place of collision by turning her round on a port helm. This decision is to be regretted for the reasons given in the answers to the questions put by the Board of Trade. The engines were, therefore, put full speed ahead and the helm hard a port, and the engines and helm were then worked, as necessary, to bring the ship back. As there was nothing to mark the position of the wreck, these manœuvres were useless. After steaming backwards and forwards for one and a half hours without finding any trace of the wreck, the "Lorenzo" proceeded to Grimsby Roads, where she anchored for the night.

The second engineer, who, at the time of the collision, was in his berth on the port side, stated that he heard the telegraph ring, and then heard a shout apparently outside his porthole. He looked through the porthole and saw a vessel with one mast and two men on board passing so close to the ship that he could have dropped aboard. He also saw a white bright light aboard the vessel, but he could not say in what position. The men appeared to be getting into a small boat. From this it appears that the "Argo" must have been cut in two, the forepart passing along the starboard side of the "Lorenzo" and the after part with two men passing on the port side. The attention of those on the bridge of the "Lorenzo" appears to have been centred to what was passing on the starboard side, and, with the exception of the second engineer, no one appears to have looked over the port side.

On the morning of the 20th August, David Pye, the coxswain of the Spurn lifeboat, noticed a boat washing up on the beach about 300 yards on the Humber side of the Spurn Lighthouse. The boat was much damaged, and bore the name "J. Bell, Gy. 'Argo.'" He also found a binnacle and compass, the latter marked "Nunn, London," a small oar, seven or eight feet of a trawl beam, and eight or ten pieces of small deck planking broken off very short as if caused by collision. He also noticed some wreckage coming round Spurn Point on the flood tide. This wreckage no doubt was part of the "Argo."

The case was one of considerable difficulty, inasmuch as the larger part of the evidence was necessarily given by the master and crew of the "Lorenzo," who were interested parties, and the evidence as to the lights seen was of a conflicting nature. The cause which chiefly contributed to the collision was, in the opinion of the Court, the fact that the night which had been clear with moonlight became very dark as the moon sank, and was obscured by clouds so that it was very difficult to distinguish dark objects even at a short distance. In these circumstances the chief question was as to the lookout upon the "Lorenzo." Upon the bridge a good lookout was being kept, but unfortunately the height of the bows of the vessel which was the same as the height of the bridge deck obscured a very considerable area in front of the vessel. With regard to the lookout in the fore-castle head, it was unfortunate that the lookout was being relieved immediately before the collision occurred, and it would have been better if an A.B. had been stationed there instead of an ordinary seaman, but upon the whole the Court was of opinion that the lookout upon the "Lorenzo" was a good and proper lookout.

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

Questions.

- (1) What was the vessel which was in collision with the s.s. "Lorenzo" in the river Humber about 10.25 p.m. on the 19th August last? Were both vessels exhibiting the proper lights shortly before and at the time of the collision?
- (2) Was a good and proper lookout kept on board the "Lorenzo"?
- (3) What was the cause of the collision and was every possible effort made by those on board the "Lorenzo" to render assistance?
- (4) Was the "Lorenzo" navigated with proper and seamanlike care?
- (5) Was the loss of the "Argo" and/or the loss of life caused by the wrongful act or default of the master of the "Lorenzo"? Does blame attach to Mr. W. B. Crichton, pilot?

Mr. Miller on behalf of the master of the "Lorenzo," Mr. Laverack on behalf of the pilot, and Mr. Kearsley on behalf of the owners of the "Argo" and the representatives of the crew of the "Argo," having addressed the Court, and Mr. Mountain having replied on behalf of the Board of Trade, the Court gave judgment and returned the following answers to the questions by the Board of Trade:—

Answers to Questions.

- (1) The vessel with which the steamship "Lorenzo" was in collision about 10.25 p.m. on the 19th August last, was the British sailing fishing boat "Argo," No. 1223.
- The steamship "Lorenzo" was exhibiting the proper lights shortly before and at the time of the collision. The "Argo" was not exhibiting the proper lights shortly before and at the time of the collision.
- (2) A good and proper lookout was kept on board the "Lorenzo."
- (3) The cause of the collision was neglect of those on board the "Argo" to exhibit the regulation light.

Those on board the "Lorenzo" did not make every possible effort to render assistance. In the opinion of the Court, Holmes' lights should have been thrown overboard by the officer of the watch to mark the place of collision, and the boat which was lowered should have been launched with a light in it as soon as the vessel had lost sufficient way to allow it. A lifebuoy with Holmes' patent light attached was thrown overboard, but the light failed to ignite. Other similar lifebuoys, as well as ordinary lifebuoys, should have been thrown overboard, but were not, although one with a patent light attached was hung on the bridge-rail ready for use, and two spare patent lights