

T.S.M.V. "CONCH"

Three lengths of cable and one anchor were lost recently owing to a cable link breaking. In view of this the remaining seven lengths of cable on port side were retested at the Glasgow Proving House, when four defective links were cut out. As this cable had originally been tested at the Cradley Heath Proving House, Mr. Paul, the Superintendent, was informed of the case and instructed to go to Glasgow and examine the cable and report. When his report was received, it was seen that he was not in agreement with the action taken by Mr. Haffner, the Superintendent of the Glasgow Proving House, in condemning these four links.

The two questions at issue are dealt with separately below, namely :-

- (1) The investigation into the cause of the failure of the chain cable link as a result of which three lengths of cable and an anchor were lost, and
- (2) The difference of opinion regarding the removal of four links from the remaining cable.

- 
- (1) The opinions expressed by Mr. Paul, Mr. Green (the Superintendent of the Netherton Proving House) and Mr. Dobson (who surveyed the vessel at Glasgow) appear to establish beyond doubt that the failure of the link occurred through a transverse impact stress, on account of the cable not straightening as it ran out of the chain locker, and the link in question becoming jammed across the mouth of the chain pipe. This view is supported by the fact that the broken pieces of the link were found in the chain locker, the fracture has a crystalline appearance consistent with a shock stress, and the moulding round the mouth of the chain pipe was found to be indented on both sides, corresponding abrasions being visible on the ends of the fractured link.

- 
- (2) Mr. Paul stated that three ordinary links and one end link had been removed from the cable, and that the only cause of complaint regarding these was that they were slightly redshort, which he contended was not detrimental and did not affect their strength, and he gave his opinion that these links should not have been cut out.

Mr. Haffner stated that to have left these links in the cable would have been entirely contrary to the Anchors & Chain Cables Act, apart from his personal opinion regarding defective links. Links which have been hammered are looked upon with suspicion, and the three ordinary links had been roughly hammered, and even then the defects were not covered. The open weld in the end link was a bad defect and should have been discovered previously.

The matter was referred to Mr. Lewis, who confirmed Mr. Haffner's remarks regarding hammered links, and the defect in the end link, and stated that this must have been present in this link prior to the retesting.

Mr. Green then investigated the matter and stated that certain small cracks are visible and that the links have been roughly hammered. He points out, however, that the retesting at Glasgow would make these defects more apparent, and while they may not have been visible during the original testing, he is of opinion that the removal of the links was necessary.

An examination in this Office of the links confirms Mr. Green's statement regarding the slight cracks and the hammer dressing, and his opinion that these links should have been cut out from the cable is concurred in.

-----

It is submitted the Glasgow Office be informed that the matter has been fully investigated, and that the explanation offered that the link fractured through jamming in the mouth of the chain pipe, is concurred in. They should further be informed that the Superintendent of the Glasgow Proving House is being advised that, in view of the enquiries made, it is considered that his action in removing the four defective links from the chain cable, was in order.

Mr. Green might be advised to the above effect, and Mr. Haffner should be informed in the same terms regarding the defective links only.

Mr. Paul might be informed that a thorough examination has been made of the links which were cut from the

cable at the Glasgow Proving House, as a result of which it is considered that the Superintendent was in order in having these removed. While the retesting may have aggravated the defects, and rendered them more readily visible, it is considered nevertheless that the examination made when the cable was first submitted for testing should have been of a more stringent character, and he should be requested to exercise greater care in future cases.

*ass.*

*[Signature]*  
11.3.32  
*[Signature]*

Ins. 14/3/32

Ins 14/3



© 2019

Lloyd's Register  
Foundation

W372-0131 (313)