

NELSON, District Judge. We are satisfied that the learned circuit judge who decided this case in the court below was right, for the reasons stated in his opinion, in holding that the ribs in the defendant's dress form, which are constructed according to the Knapp patent, and are composed of a single wire in such manner as to form a double rib, U-shaped at the lower ends, and extending in an unbroken piece the entire length, and supported in position by being rigidly attached to a waist band divided into segments, can in no sense be held to be an equivalent for the combination of ribs and springs described in the first claim of the plaintiff's patent. Decree affirmed.

THE WELHAVEN.¹

WILLIAMS v. THE WELHAVEN et al.

(District Court, S. D. Alabama. October 8, 1892.)

1. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—CONFLICT OF TREATY AND STATUTE.
When an act of congress conflicts with a prior treaty, the act controls. *Steamship Co. v. Hedden*, 43 Fed. Rep. 17, followed.
2. TREATY WITH NORWAY—JURISDICTION OF CONSUL.
The Norwegian consul has by treaty exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine complaints of ill treatment of seamen shipping from an American port for a voyage on a Norwegian vessel.
3. SAME—ADMIRALTY COURTS.
United States statutes conferring admiralty jurisdiction do not apply to claims of bad treatment suffered by an American serving as a seaman on a Norwegian vessel.

In Admiralty. Libel in rem and in personam.

Henry Williams, a citizen of the United States, filed a libel for damages and for wages against the Norwegian steamship Welhaven and her master, claiming that he shipped at Mobile for a round voyage to Tampico, and that on his arrival in Mobile bay, on the return trip, he was put ashore, manacled, and finally discharged at Mobile, without full pay. The Norwegian consul at Mobile, William H. Leinkauf, interposed by petition, setting out that this was a matter within his consular jurisdiction, and that he was engaged at the time the libel was filed in investigating the case.

Smith & Gaynor, for libellant.

Pillans, Torrey & Hanaw, for claimant and for Norwegian consul.

TOULMIN, District Judge. It has been held that, where an act of congress is in conflict with a prior treaty, the act must control, since it is of equal force with the treaty and of later date, (*Steamship Co. v. Hedden*, 43 Fed. Rep. 17;) hence the contention of libellant's counsel could be sustained if the statute which he invokes in this case (Rev. St. §§ 4079-4081) was in conflict with the treaty between the United States and Norway and Sweden, which must govern the action of the court in the matter under considera-

¹Reported by Peter J. Hamilton, Esq., of the Mobile, Ala., bar.

tion, or if such statute had any application to the case at all. But my opinion is that it is neither; that it is not in conflict with the treaty; and that it has no application to a case of this character. The earnest desire of this court to afford to seamen every right and protection authorized by the law, and the sympathy I have with that class of people to which libellant belongs, strengthened by the able and impressive argument of his counsel, induced me to take for examination and careful consideration the matter and arguments submitted before a decision by the court denying the jurisdiction prayed for; but such consideration has only served to confirm the correctness of the decision of this court in the case of *The Burchard*, 42 Fed. Rep. 608, where it was held that the court had no jurisdiction in a case very similar to this one. In addition to that case, I cite, as sustaining the decision in this, *The Salomoni*, 29 Fed. Rep. 534; *The Marie*, 49 Fed. Rep. 286; *The Elwine Kreplin*, 9 Blatchf. 438; *In re Ross*, 140 U. S. 453, 11 Sup. Ct. Rep. 897. I am therefore constrained to sustain the exceptions to the libel, and to order that the libel be dismissed.

O'ROURKE v. NEW YORK DYEWOOD EXTRACT & CHEMICAL CO.¹

(District Court, S. D. New York. March 31, 1891.)

SHIPPING—VESSELS AT WHARVES—CONCEALED SEWER—NECESSITY FOR NOTICE.

A boat which, in the ordinary course of business, moored at high water, in the usual way, at respondent's bulkhead, where the master had never before been, and which at low water was sunk by a discharge from a sewer, concealed at high water, and of which her master was not notified, was *held* entitled to recover her damages by reason of the failure of respondent to give notice of the concealed danger.

In Admiralty. Libel by Patrick O'Rourke against the New York Dyewood Extract & Chemical Company for damage to a canal boat sunk by discharge from a sewer while lying at respondent's bulkhead. Decree for libellant.

Stewart & Macklin, for libellant.

Charles H. Russell, for respondent.

BROWN, District Judge. The evidence leaves no doubt, I think, that the discharge of water from the sewer pipe between high and low water mark along the respondent's bulkhead at Greenpoint, although somewhat guarded by spiles running across its mouth, was sufficient to flood any loaded canal boat that moored close alongside of it unawares. The captain of the Cayuga had never been there before; he arrived at high water, when the sewer was covered, and was not visible. He reported his arrival with coal at the respondent's office a few rods distant, and received no notice of the need of breasting off from the concealed sewer. While waiting for the arrival of bills of lading and the necessary preparations for a discharge, the captain, having moored his boat in

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