

by the latter is treated as a fund representing the lost ship, and as such chargeable with half the loss on her own cargo. This is enforced notwithstanding the fact that the statute makes "the interest of the owner in the ship and pending freight" at the close of the voyage, the limit of his liability. For his interest in the ship still remains in the form of a demand against the other vessel for half damages, for which he must account. It is the same with a bottomry bond; for this conveys, in pledge, all the owner's interest in his ship; and under the bond, and under the statute alike, the transfer of his interest in the vessel includes, by necessary implication, the fund recoverable, as the representative of the ship, for her tortious destruction.

I find, therefore, that the bond was a legal lien upon that part of the cargo which arrived in Hamburg, and which was worth more than the amount of the bond. The libelants, having necessarily paid the bottomry loan in full, in order to obtain possession of the cargo, are entitled to be reimbursed so much as upon a proper adjustment was chargeable to the respondent as owner of the ship and freight. The rules of general average being somewhat different in this country from those of England, if the parties are dissatisfied with the adjustment made in London, a reference may be taken to ascertain the proper amount according to our law, there being no evidence that any different law is applicable.

Decree accordingly, with costs.

REARDON v. ARKELL.

(District Court, S. D. New York. February 7, 1894.)

PILOTAGE—LAWS OF NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY—REV. ST. §§ 4235, 4236—RIGHT OF NEW JERSEY PILOT TO SUE IN NEW YORK.

Section 4236 of the United States Revised Statutes, in conjunction with section 4235, by necessary implication makes applicable, in favor of pilots, the laws of either New York or New Jersey; and hence a New Jersey pilot may, by virtue of such statutes, maintain his action in the United States courts of New York, against the consignee of a vessel, for pilotage services rendered in New York waters.

In Admiralty. On exceptions to a libel filed by John A. Reardon against James W. Arkell to recover for pilotage services. Exceptions overruled.

Carpenter & Mosher, for libellant.

Wheeler, Cortis & Godkin, for respondent.

BROWN, District Judge. On the 17th day of August, 1893, the British steamship Jersey City was piloted into the port of New York by the libellant, a pilot duly licensed under the laws of the state of New Jersey; and on the 23d day of August she was again piloted by him back to sea. The pilotage fees not being paid, the above libel in personam was filed against the respondent, as the consignee of the ship, who entered and cleared her at this port. The pilotage laws of New York and New Jersey alike make the pilotage payable

"by the master, owner, consignee, or agent entering or clearing a vessel jointly or severally," and prescribe the same pilotage rates.

Exceptions to the libel have been filed by the respondent, on the grounds (1) that the laws of New York provide only for pilots licensed under the laws of the state of New York, and therefore are not available to the libelant, (*Brown v. Elwell*, 60 N. Y. 249; *Hopkins v. Wyckoff*, 1 Daly, 176;) (2) that the laws of New Jersey have no extraterritorial force to create a statutory liability in the consignee of the ship entering her on arrival at the port of New York.

Under the construction given to some sections of the pilotage laws of New York by the court of appeals in *Brown v. Elwell*, above cited, I should find difficulty in sustaining the libel if the laws of either state could only be applied to the present case by virtue of their own inherent force.

By section 4235, however, of the United States Revised Statutes, re-enacting the act of August 7, 1789, it is provided that all "pilots in the * * * ports of the United States shall continue to be regulated in conformity with the existing laws of the state respectively, wherein such pilots may be;" and by the following section (4236) the master of a vessel coming into this port may lawfully employ a New York or a New Jersey pilot. See *The Abercorn*, 26 Fed. 877.

The construction of these two provisions with reference to the points taken by the exceptions, is somewhat embarrassing. The well-known intention of section 4236, originally passed in March, 1837, (5 Stat. 153, c. 22,) was to end the conflicts and disputes that arose concerning the right to employ pilots licensed under the laws of different states bounding on pilotage waters. In giving authority to masters to employ a pilot duly licensed by either of such states, it could not have been the intent of congress that the pilots should be without the power to enforce any compensation at all. That act must be read in connection with the provision of the act of 1789, (Rev. St. § 4235,) which is in *pari materia*; and when thus read, the phrase "the laws of the states respectively wherein such pilots may be" must be regarded as applicable to the "employment" authorized by section 4236.

Although a New Jersey pilot may not in terms be provided for by the New York law, when piloting in New York waters, I think a reasonable construction of the act of congress authorizing his "employment" in such waters, and also declaring that "pilotage shall be regulated by the law of the state where the pilot may be," adopts the local law, and makes it applicable to the New Jersey pilot so "employed" as much as if the act said expressly that the rates and other regulations as to the pilotage authorized by the act to be thus "employed," should be those prescribed by the local law of the states wherein the pilots may be. This is the most literal interpretation of the words "wherein such pilots may be," and makes them refer to the place where the service is rendered, or the port to which the vessel is taken, and for which the pilotage service was

employed. The phrase "wherein such pilots may be" may also be interpreted to refer to the place where the pilots are licensed; and if that were the meaning intended, the laws of New Jersey would here be applicable. It is immaterial, in this case, to decide which of these interpretations should be given, since the laws of both states are the same; and both make the consignee liable at the same rates. Considering, therefore, that section 4236, in conjunction with section 4235, by necessary implication makes applicable in favor of pilots the laws of the one state or the other, I am of the opinion that the pilot may maintain his action in a case like the present against the consignee by virtue of these acts of congress.

The exceptions are, therefore, overruled.

THE BOLIVIA.¹

DEEHAN v. THE BOLIVIA.

(District Court, S. D. New York. December 18, 1893.)

NEGLIGENCE—PERSONAL INJURIES—FELLOW SERVANT—WINCHMAN'S ERROR.

Where cargo was being loaded into a hatch of a steamship by means of three whips, and certain boxes fell from one of the loads upon libelant, who was working in the hold, not by reason of the improper use of three whips in one hatch, whereby two of the loads interfered, as the libelant claimed, but, as the evidence showed, because the winchman prematurely let go of the brake of the winch, it was held that libelant could not recover, as the injury was occasioned by the negligence of a fellow servant.

In Admiralty. Libel for personal injuries. Dismissed.

S. B. Johnson and Joseph Fettretch, for libelant.

Wing, Shoudy & Putnam, for claimant.

BROWN, District Judge. At about 11 o'clock in the forenoon of March 3, 1893, the libelant, while at work in the lower hold of the steamship Bolivia, lying at the foot of East Twenty-Sixth street, and engaged in loading barrels of resin, was seriously injured by the fall of several boxes of logwood, which were at the same time being loaded, through the same hatch, upon the orlop deck, next above the hold. He was struck in the back by one or more of the boxes, and the spine so injured that the lower part of his body became paralyzed.

For the libelant it is contended, that the accident arose in consequence of the improper use of three falls or whips in the same hatch, so that the load of boxes collided with the draft of resin barrels which were descending at the same time, a little below the former; whereby some of the boxes on top were knocked off, and fell upon the libelant.

For the claimant it is contended, that the use of three whips at the same time is justifiable, being a frequent practice, where there

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