

"THE ST. JOSEPH ISLANDER"

(cont.)

The main engines of this vessel were built on the mass production system.

There is considerable correspondence regarding the acceptance of mass production engines for fitting aboard classed vessels and the attitude of the Committee was stated in a letter dated 1.9.49 to the Principal Surveyor, New York, which after detailing the requirements for the examination of mass produced engines, states "A machinery installation incorporating engines built under these conditions would not, as already implied, fulfil the Society's requirements for the assignment of the Maltese Cross, but a Manufacturer would be furnished with a Report Form 10 setting forth clearly the conditions of survey under which the engines had been constructed and this certificate would no doubt be forwarded by the Manufacturer to the Purchaser.

Main engines built under these mass-produced conditions and surveyed as indicated above would be eligible for installation on board a vessel classed or intended for classification with this Society provided, of course, the Owners were agreeable to accept an LMC notation without the distinguishing mark \otimes : in this connection it is thought that the Report Form 10 issued to the Manufacturers would afford to the Owners the necessary explanation as to why the \otimes was not assigned".

The following is a P.S. to the above letter: "You will, of course, be well aware of the Committee's attitude regarding the assignment of the Maltese Cross, i.e. that this is only assigned when the whole of the construction, including the testing of materials, has been carried out under the personal supervision of a Surveyor to this Society, the \otimes therefore being a statement of fact".


In the case of these particular main engines the Cleveland Surveyor in his First Entry report recommended a record of \otimes LMC and was requested to state why it was considered that the distinguishing mark \otimes should be assigned in this case.

The Cleveland Surveyor in his reply states "In this particular case, a crankshaft and connecting rod made from the same heats as those used in the engines were cut up and tested by the Surveyors in accordance with the Rules.

As the customer had insisted on the Maltese Cross for these engines, the above procedure was adopted. As you know this manufacturer orders crankshaft and connecting rod forgings in large batches, and for them to order special L.R. tested

forgings for this particular order would have involved considerable delay in obtaining same.

It is only in very isolated cases that the Maltese Cross is required on mass produced engines and when such is the case, the above procedure is followed."

As according to the First Entry report, the Surveyor has only made one visit for surveying these main engines and as, if this system of testing main engine forgings was allowed it would follow that all engines made from the same heat would be eligible for the Maltese Cross, it is considered that the record of IMC without the distinguishing mark  should be assigned in this case.

JS *K.V.*
27.7.54

*In accordance with an endorsement dated 3-8-54 it is submitted the vessel be closed with a record of F L MC 10.52
Strengthened for navigation in ice.*



JS
4/8/54
© 2021

Lloyd's Register
Foundation

8078 2/2