

REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH CASES.

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act.)

**ADMIRALTY—BERTH NOTE—"DISPUTE ARISING AT LOADING PORTS"
—ARBITRATION—STAY OF PROCEEDINGS.**

The Dawlish (1910) P. 839. This was an appeal from the order of a judge of a County Court dismissing the action with costs. By a berth note it was agreed between the plaintiffs (ship-owner) and defendants (grain merchants) that the plaintiffs' ship should go to the sea of Azov, and there load a cargo of grain, and in case of "any dispute at loading ports" under this berth note it is to be submitted to a specified court of arbitration whose decision was to be final. The vessel was loaded, and for stevedoring the defendants charged 40 roubles per 1,000 chelverts in accordance with the tariff on the margin of the berth note, and deducted the amount from the freight. On the accounts being received by the plaintiffs' London agent it was objected that the defendants had overcharged and the action was brought to recover the difference, but the Divisional Court (Evans, P.P.D., and Deane, J.) dismissed the appeal, holding that it was a dispute within the arbitration clause, it being a dispute as to the proper charges for stevedoring at the port of loading.

ADMIRALTY — SALVAGE — APPEAL COURT REDUCING AMOUNT OF SALVAGE.

The Port Hunter (1910) P. 343. This was an appeal against the amount awarded for salvage by Deane, J. The defendants' steamship with a cargo of wool bound for England broke down in the Red Sea owing to damage to her propeller. She was picked up by the plaintiffs' vessel and towed for six days, about 830 miles, to a safe anchorage in Suez Roads. The weather was fine except towards the end of the towage, when the usual northerly wind and some sea were encountered. The salving vessel lost three days and had been put to expense, amount not stated. The salving vessel cargo and freight were valued at £88,000 and the salvaged vessel cargo and freight at £269,700. Deane, J., had awarded £10,000, but the Court of Appeal (Williams and Buckley, L.J.J., and Evans, P.P.D.) reduced the amount to £6,000, being of the opinion that the court below had