

was 1744, but we do not know what her Net Tonnage was with the original engine arrangement.

"Canadian Railway and Marine World" reported in February of 1914 that: "The Montreal Transportation Co.'s electrically propelled vessel TYNEMOUNT... which is intended for service on the Great Lakes, sailed from the Tyne, Eng., recently, on her maiden voyage, to Santander, Spain. It is said that before coming to Canada, she will make a number of short sea voyages."

The same journal, in September of 1914, noted that: "On her trial trips, she proved a failure, and the M.T.Co. declined to accept her. A second series of trials proved no more successful, and the propelling machinery was removed and replaced by ordinary steam equipment. She sailed from England July 9, and took 19 days in crossing. She is of the ordinary type of lake vessel... and she has a speed of about 10 knots an hour. She was originally named TYNEMOUNT, but later her name was changed to PORT DALHOUSIE."

There are four interesting things about this latter quotation. One, of course, is that M.T.Co. would not take the ship and it was necessary for her to be fitted with more traditional power to sell her for lake operation. Second is that the problem almost certainly related to the speed she was able to attain, and the 10-knot speed she made after the installation of steam machinery was about the same as most canallers of the period, making her acceptable as a laker. The third point of interest is that this article, printed in September of 1914, reports a name change that undoubtedly occurred in the summer of 1914 but was not reported by most sources until 1915. What is very interesting but totally lacking from the C.R.&M.W. article is any mention of a change in ownership for the ship.

At this point, we should note that the October 1922 issue of "The Marine Engineer and Naval Architect" printed an interesting letter to the editor. It stated: "Our attention has been drawn to the article in the August issue of your journal dealing with the progress of electric ship propulsion. In this article the following remark occurs in relation to the Diesel electric ship TYNEMOUNT: - 'Unfortunately, the performance of the vessel's propelling machinery on service did not justify the high hopes which the early trials had seemed to warrant. Due regard, however, should be had to the fact that the Diesel engine of 10 years ago was not by any means the success that it is today.'

"This conveys the impression that the trials of the propelling machinery were satisfactory, that the boat was put into service, and on servicetroubles were experienced with the Diesel engines. This is quite incorrect. The boat was never put into service (yes she was, but in European waters, not for M.T.Co. on the lakes, as witness the maiden voyage to Santander, etc., already mentioned -Ed.), and the engines were not the cause of the trouble, as the identical engines without any alternation were, after removal from the ship, put into service elsewhere and are still working quite satisfactorily.

"The engines, both before installation in the ship and after removal, gave their full rated power and the specified overload when tested on the brake, but it was found that a considerably greater power was required than the engines were designed to give or were capable of giving. The engines were of the same design as many engines supplied previously and since, and which have proved entirely satisfactory over years of arduous service."

The letter was signed for Mirrlees, Bickerton & Day Limited by Charles Day, Managing Director. The journal's editor replied: "We take this opportunity of placing these facts before our readers, but would point out that our remarks as to the unsatisfactory performance of the TYNEMOUNT's propelling machinery referred to that equipment as a whole and not to the Diesel section."

In any event, the 1915-1916 Lloyd's Register showed that the TYNEMOUNT's re-