

any payment therefor from him, and gave a check to Heilner & Co. for the damage, which they transferred to Harjes, the consignee. Mr. Harjes was part owner of the Annie Harjes, and sent her to Port Johnson for the coal.

Upon the above facts some troublesome questions of insurance law have been suggested; but it is unnecessary to consider them, as, upon other grounds, I think the libel should be dismissed. *The Sydney*, 27 Fed. Rep. 119. The coal having been bought by the consignee, and paid for by him on the 22d, before the accident, and delivered upon the vessel sent by him to receive it, the delivery to the consignee was thereby complete, the title thereto passed to him, and the shippers no longer had any interest in it. The designation of Seventy-Sixth street in the bill of lading as the place of unloading was for the consignee's benefit only; it could be lawfully changed by him *ad libitum*. The shipper had no interest in it. The consignee's direction to the boat to proceed to Seventy-Fifth or Seventy-Ninth street to discharge, if no berth could be obtained at Seventy-Sixth street, being a direction competent for him to give, the vessel is protected by this order against any charge of negligence in obeying it, whether the dock was a perfectly safe and proper one or not. The consignee had notice also of her presence there, accepted part of the cargo, and made no objection to her lying there. When the shower came on the captain tried to get away, but could not, because two schooners had in the mean time come up and made fast outside of him, and they refused to move. He was helpless. Under such circumstances no action for going to that dock could be maintained against the boat by either the shipper or the consignee, and none therefore by the libellant. A similar accident occurred to a coal-boat at this wharf in July, 1884, which was the subject of a suit in *Behan v. Mayor, etc.*, 24 Fed. Rep. 239. The evidence in the present case was very different from the evidence in that case as regards any precautions usually taken against the sewer, and its ordinary safe condition. But it is unnecessary to consider this further. Libel dismissed; but, as the dismissal is upon a point raised only by amendment of the pleadings at the trial, it must be without costs.

SCOWS 9, 16, AND 24.¹

WALSH v. SCOWS 9, 16, AND 24.

(District Court, S. D. New York. April 28, 1891.)

SALVAGE—SCOWS DERELICT IN GALE—TOWED INTO PORT.

A tug took in tow three scows loaded with mud from New York harbor, bound for the dumping ground outside of Sandy Hook. While on the way, so furious a gale arose that the tug, to save herself, cut the hawser when the scows were near the eastern end of Gedney's channel, and the scows thereupon went drifting out to sea in the gale and the ebb-tide. One man was aboard of each scow. The tug Olive

¹ Reported by Edward G. Benedict, Esq., of the New York bar.

Baker, coming up the Jersey coast with a tow, perceived the scows, and, after anchoring her tow, went to their rescue, and reached them about seven miles from shore. Owing to the wind and sea, the master of the tug was unable to take the men off the scows. He therefore got a hawser to the scows, and brought them safely to port, through great difficulty and personal peril. The scows were cut adrift about 11 A. M. The gale did not moderate until 7 P. M. The scows were absolutely helpless, and practically derelict. They were worth \$20,000. The value of the Olive Baker was \$15,000. She was damaged by the service \$500. Held, that the sum of \$5,000 should be awarded as salvage.

In Admiralty. Suit to recover salvage.

Wheeler, Cortis & Godkin, for claimants.

Goodrich, Deady & Goodrich, for libellant.

BROWN, J. On the morning of November 22, 1890, the steam-tug John Hilliard took in tow upon a long hawser three scows, Nos. 9, 16, and 24, in single file, loaded with mud, bound for the dumping ground outside of Sandy Hook. The weather was mild when she started, but in the course of the forenoon the wind came on heavy from the north-west, and between 10 and 11 o'clock became so furious a gale, and the sea so rough, that the pilot and crew of the tug, to save their own lives, cut the hawser, and abandoned the scows, which thereupon went drifting out to sea in the gale and the ebb-tide. They were cut adrift at about the easterly end of Gedney's channel. The pilot of the tug testifies that he had previously made several vain attempts to manage the tow, and to bring it into smoother water. One man was aboard of each scow. They were Norwegians, and could not understand the hails from the tug. The pilot could not take the men off because the sea was too rough to permit his boat to get along-side. When the hawser was cut, he says, the water was "even with the half-door of the fire-room," and that "the boat was so much under water that he didn't think she would come up at all when he let go." He reached the lee of the Jersey shore. Not long afterwards, the pilot of the libellant's steam-tug Olive Baker, coming up the Jersey coast with a schooner in tow on a hawser, observed the scows adrift at a considerable distance, and, surmising that men were on board, and in danger of their lives, and being himself acquainted with that business, determined, after consultation with the crew, to attempt to go to their rescue. He thereupon took the schooner to a safe anchorage near the Jersey coast, and reached the scows a little to the southeastward of the Sandy Hook light-ship, about 7 miles from shore, but found it impossible, owing to the furious wind and sea, to take the men off the scows, and he thereupon determined to endeavor to tow them into smooth water. A hawser was finally attached to the scows, and by a circuitous course to the south-west they reached smoother water in the afternoon, and late at night got safely into port. The gale was heavy till about 7 P. M., when it moderated. The above libel is filed to recover salvage compensation for the above service.

The case is one of unusual merit. Not only the scows, but the lives of the men on board, were in evident peril. They had been abandoned by their own tug. Several other tugs had been requested to go to their rescue, and had refused, on account of the danger of the undertaking.

One witness testifies that in his opinion the scows would have ridden out the gale if not rescued; others thought not. Considering the fact that the gale moderated at 7 P. M., that the scows did not get into smoother water until about 3 P. M., and were therefore exposed to the gale for four hours without substantial injury, so far as appears, although from 3 to 7 P. M. the sea was probably rising, and the danger to such scows greater, it is not impossible that they might have ridden out the gale in safety. Though I cannot, therefore, treat the case as one of certain destruction of the scows except for the relief afforded by these salvors, the peril was evidently great. Abandoned by their own tug, though not strictly derelict, they were for the time being practically so, as the men on board were wholly destitute of any means of helping themselves. The anchors were very light, not adapted for service at sea, and if thrown overboard would have been of no use. The value of the scows was \$20,000; that of the Olive Baker \$15,000. In rendering the service, one side of the tug's house was stove in, and her boiler shifted. The expense of the necessary repairs, including demurrage during the necessary time for making them, and the loss of towage in abandoning the schooner, amounted to about \$500. The chief elements in the case that entitle the salvors to a liberal reward are the imminent jeopardy of the tow, with the lives of those on board, and the great bravery, persistence, and skill of the pilot of the Olive Baker and his crew in going to and in rescuing the tow after it had been abandoned by one tug, and after others had feared and refused to attempt to save it. In rendering these services the salvors labored under peculiar difficulties, to some extent in peril of their own lives, and their success was perfect in rescuing the tow without substantial injury. Under such circumstances, I think an allowance of \$5,000 no more than a suitable recognition of the peculiar merit of this salvage service. Of this sum the pilot and crew should receive one-half, and the owners of the tug the other half; the latter including the damage to the tug. Out of the allowance to the master and crew I allow \$500 to the master, and the residue is to be divided among the master, engineer, and crew, in proportion to their wages.

THE TANCARVILLE.¹

ATLANTIC & C. S. S. Co. v. THE TANCARVILLE.

(District Court, S. D. New York. April 23, 1891.)

SALVAGE—STEAM-SHIP—BROKEN MACHINERY—TOWAGE TO PORT.

The steam-ship Tancarville, deeply laden, met with rough weather, and her machinery broke down. She made sail, but, owing to her deep lading, was unable to steer properly, made little progress, and began to jettison her cargo. The weather was fair, but the vessel was somewhat out of the track of steamers, and in a region especially liable to storms. The steam-ship Venezuela came up, and,

¹ Reported by Edward G. Benedict, Esq., of the New York bar.