

commercial world. I have never known one of keener and more comprehensive insight, more liberal views, and more resolute determination to achieve the best results for the public than the elder Mr. Ismay.

The report of this commission was adopted by the British Board of Trade.

The principle of these rules was approved by the conference (Ibid, vol. 2, pp. 1091, 1903), and it recommended: "That the several governments adopt measures to secure compliance with this principle in regard to such boats and appliances for vessels of 150 tons and upwards, gross tonnage."

Unfortunately the several governments did not adopt these recommendations. A great diversity came to prevail in the equipment of ocean steamers belonging to different countries. Some nations were exacting, some were lax. The result was an unfair discrimination against the vessels of those countries which had adopted more stringent regulations.

Salvage.

Another subject that has been considered at the third international conference on maritime law is that of salvage. The ratification of the salvage treaty was consented to by the Senate, January 18, 1912. The text of the Convention is in Vol. 4, Am. Journal Int. Law Supp., p. 126.

But unfortunately this conference did not go far enough in reference to the important subject of compensation for saving life at sea. By the ancient maritime law, salvage compensation for the saving of life at sea, unconnected with the saving of property, was not allowed. This is still, I regret to say, the law of the United States, although it is true that our courts will grant more liberal compensation for the saving of property when it is accompanied by the saving of life. This was so held by Judge Ware in *The Emblem*, 2 Wall. 68, in 1840, and by Judge Benedict in *The George W. Clyde*, 80 Fed. 157, in 1897.

The case of *The Emblem* is a remarkable illustration of the