and held by the deceased, in not furnishing sufficient life-belts, in not properly distributing the life-belts, in not having life-boats ready to launch, and in placing incompetent men at the wheel to do the steering.

There was no doubt, the learned Judge said, that the plaintiffs' son was washed overboard by a wave; but, even if negligence in any particular was shewn, there was nothing to prove that that negligence was the cause of or contributed to the death.

In an effort to rescue the deceased after he was overboard, there was some delay in launching the life-boat by reason of its not being properly hung or the rope not being of the right strength; but there was nothing to shew that anything would have been accomplished if the life-boat had been launched in the quickest way. The sea was turbulent; it was a heavy gale; and the man was quickly lost to the sight of those on board. The chances were that the life-boat would have been lost rather than that the deceased would have been rescued.

Connolly v. Grenier, Connolly v. Martel (1909), 42 S.C.R. 242, distinguished.

Upon the evidence, it could not be found that the vessel was unseaworthy when she put to sea.

Reference to Hedley v. Pinkney & Sons S.S. Co. Limited, [1892] 1 Q.B. 58.

Assuming that there was defective equipment, unless the accident was caused by the defendants, there could be no liability. There was an adequate cause for the accident, and it was not lack of or defect in equipment.

There was no contributory negligence on the part of the deceased.

The plaintiffs were entitled, as administrators of the estate of the deceased, to $18.66 for wages.

The action should be dismissed except as to the wages, for which, if necessary, judgment should go. No costs to or against either party.