



# LLOYD'S LIST LAW REPORTS

Editor :

H. P. HENLEY

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

Assistant Editor :

E. S. MATHERS

of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

1952

Volume 1

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY LLOYD'S  
AT LLOYD'S, LONDON, ENGLAND

1952

CASES CITED.\*

PAGE

A/B Karlshamns Oljefabriker and Another v. Monarch Steamship Company, Ltd.	[1949] A.C. 196; (1948) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 137	348
A/S Tankexpress v. Compagnie Financière Belge des Pétroles S.A.	(1948) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 43	527
Alderslade v. Hendon Laundry, Ltd.	[1945] 1 K.B. 189	1
Altair, The	[1897] P. 105	197
Anderson v. Downes	[1916] P. 49	280
Aslan v. Imperial Airways, Ltd.	(1933) 149 L.T. 276; 45 Ll.L.Rep. 316	197
Atlantic Shipping and Trading Company, Ltd. v. Louis Dreyfus & Co.	[1922] 2 A.C. 250; 10 Ll.L.Rep. 703	485
Attorney-General of Southern Nigeria v. John Holt & Co. (Liverpool), Ltd., and Others	[1915] A.C. 599	335
Bank of Australasia and Others v. Olan Line Steamers, Ltd.	[1916] 1 K.B. 39	485
Barker and Another v. M'Andrew	(1865) 18 C.B. (N.S.) 759	485
Barnard v. Birch	[1919] 2 Ir.R. 404	280
Baumwoll Manufactur von Carl Scheibler v. Furness	[1893] A.C. 8	197
Belfast Ropework Company, Ltd. v. Bushell	[1918] 1 K.B. 210	197
Bellanoeh, The	[1907] P. 170	38
Bentzen v. Taylor, Sons & Co. (No. 2)	[1893] 2 Q.B. 274	527
Berg & Son v. Rotterdamsche Lloyd	(1918) 23 Com. Cas. 288	548
Biddell Brothers v. E. Clemens Horst Company	[1911] 1 K.B. 934; [1912] A.C. 18	390
Blakie and Others v. Stembridge	(1859) 28 L.J. (C.P.) 329	197
Blythe & Co. v. Richards, Turpin & Co.	(1916) L.J. (K.B.) 1425	385
Bodleweli, The	[1907] P. 286	467
Bourgeois v. Weddell & Co.	[1924] 1 K.B. 539	330
Bowes and Others v. Shand and Others	(1877) 2 App. Cas. 455	197
British Oil & Cake Mills, Ltd. v. Moor Line, Ltd.	(1935) 51 Ll.L.Rep. 292; (C.A.) 53	313
Brown & Co., Ltd., and Others v. Nitrate Producers' Steamship Company, Ltd.	(1937) 58 Ll.L.Rep. 188	485
Bruce v. Nicolopulo	(1855) 11 Ex. 129	485
Cairnbahn, The	[1914] P. 25	159
Caledonian Railway Company v. Mulholland or Warwick	[1898] A.C. 216	104
Cap Palos, The	[1921] P. 458; 8 Ll.L.Rep. 309	367
Cargill, The	[1951] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 527	548
Carron Park, The	(1890) 15 P.D. 203	485
Carslogie, The	[1951] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 441	467
Caswell v. Powell Duffryn Associated Collieries, Ltd.	[1940] A.C. 152	318
Chartered Bank of India, Australia, and China v. British India Steam Navigation Company, Ltd.	[1909] A.C. 372	485
Chillingworth v. Esche	[1924] 1 Ch. 97	71
Chowdhary and Another v. Gillot and Others	[1947] 2 All E.R. 541	104
Christel Vinnen, The	[1924] P. 208; 19 Ll.L.Rep. 272	485
Christmas v. General Cleaning Contractors, Ltd., and Caledonian Club Trust, Ltd.	[1952] 1 K.B. 141	399
Commissioners of Inland Revenue v. Ayrshire Employers' Mutual Insurance Association, Ltd.	(1946) 79 Ll.L.Rep. 307; 27 T.C. 331	17
Mutual Assurance Company, Ltd. v. Cornish	(1926) 12 T.C. 841	17

\* Excluding cases cited in United States v. Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company and Others, p. 520.

## CASES CITED—continued.

PAGE

Comptoir Commercial Anversoise v. Power, Son & Co.	[1920] 1 K.B. 868; (1919) 1 Ll.L.Rep. 266 ... ..	297, 385
Comptoir d'Achat et de Vente du Boerenbond Belge, S.A. v. Luis de Ridder, Ltda.	[1949] A.C. 293; 82 Ll.L.Rep. 270 ... ..	390
Corby, (Decd.), In the Goods of ... ..	(1854) 1 Spinks E. & A. 292 ... ..	280
Corporacion Argentina de Productores de Carnes v. Royal Mail Lines, Ltd.	(1939) 64 Ll.L.Rep. 188 ... ..	485
Cory and Others v. Bristow ... ..	(1877) 2 App. Cas. 262 ... ..	65
— v. Churchwardens, etc., of Greenwich	(1872) L.R. 7 C.P. 499 ... ..	65
Cummings v. London Bullion Company, Ltd. ...	[1952] 1 All E.R. 383 ... ..	456
Davies v. Mann ... ..	(1842) 10 M. & W. 546 ... ..	96
— v. Swan Motor Company (Swansea), Ltd. (James, Third Party)	[1949] 2 K.B. 291 ... ..	104
Dedman and Others v. Godfrey and Another ...	[1950] P. 130 ... ..	280
Devonshire, The ... ..	[1912] A.C. 634 ... ..	197
Di Ferdinando v. Simon, Smits & Co., Ltd. ...	[1920] 3 K.B. 409; 4 Ll.L.Rep. 264 ... ..	456
Dimitrios N. Rallias, The ... ..	(1922) 13 Ll.L.Rep. 363 ... ..	485
Donoghue v. Stevenson ... ..	[1932] A.C. 562 ... ..	104
Donovan v. Cammell Laird & Co., Ltd., and Others	(1949) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 642 ... ..	255
Dredge and Another v. Conway, Jones & Co. ...	[1901] 2 K.B. 42 ... ..	144
Elderslie Steamship Company, Ltd. v. Borthwick	[1905] A.C. 93 ... ..	485
Empire Nene, The ... ..	(1948) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 101 ... ..	548
English and Scottish Joint Co-operative Wholesale Society, Ltd. v. Commissioner of Agricultural Income-Tax, Assam	[1948] A.C. 405 ... ..	17
Equitable Trust Company of New York v. Dawson Partners, Ltd.	(1926) 25 Ll.L.Rep. 90 ... ..	153
Eurymedon, The ... ..	[1938] P. 41; (1937) 59 Ll.L.Rep. 214 ... ..	96
Euston (Earl of) v. Lord Henry Seymour ...	(1802) 2 Curt. 339 ... ..	280
Flower v. Ebbw Vale Steel, Iron & Coal Company, Ltd.	[1934] 2 K.B. 132 ... ..	318
Forfarshire, The ... ..	[1908] P. 339 ... ..	367
Gibaud v. Great Eastern Railway Company ...	[1921] 2 K.B. 426 ... ..	367
Glengoil Steamship Company and Gray v. Pilkington and Others	(1897) 28 S.C.R. 146 ... ..	1
Gloucester Coast, The ... ..	(1929) 34 Ll.L.Rep. 12 ... ..	273
Goodwin v. Roberts and Others ... ..	(1875) L.R. 10 Ex. 337 ... ..	197
Gossage, (Decd.), In the Estate of ... ..	[1921] P. 194 ... ..	280
Greenock Corporation v. Caledonian Railway Company	[1917] A.C. 556 ... ..	197
Greta Holme, The ... ..	[1897] A.C. 596 ... ..	467
Guaranty Trust Company of New York v. Hannay & Co.	[1918] 2 K.B. 623 ... ..	153
— v. Van den Berghs, Ltd., and Others	(1925) 22 Ll.L.Rep. 447 ... ..	153
Hadley v. Baxendale ... ..	(1854) 9 Exch. 341 ... ..	348
Hale, In the Goods of ... ..	[1915] 2 Ir.R. 362 ... ..	280, 292
Hansson v. Hamel & Horley, Ltd. ... ..	[1922] 2 A.C. 36; 10 Ll.L.Rep. 507 ... ..	183
Harnett v. Bond and Another ... ..	[1925] A.C. 669 ... ..	431
Haseldine v. C. A. Daw & Son, Ltd., and Others ...	[1941] 2 K.B. 343 ... ..	104

## CASES CITED—continued.

PAGE

<i>Hawthornbank</i> , The ... ..	[1904] P. 120 ... ..	38
<i>Hayes</i> , (Decd.), In the Goods of ... ..	(1839) 2 Curt. 338 ... ..	280
<i>Heilbut</i> , Symons & Co. v. Buckleton ... ..	[1913] A.C. 30 ... ..	562
<i>Henaghan v. Rederiet Forangirene</i> ... ..	[1936] 2 All E.R. 1426 ... ..	255
<i>Henderson, In Re</i> ; <i>Nouvion v. Freeman</i> ... ..	(C.A.) (1887) 37 Ch.D. 244; (H.L.) (1889) 15 App. Cas. 1 ... ..	456
<i>Herschalt v. Stewart &amp; Ardern, Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1940] 1 K.B. 155 ... ..	104
<i>Hillen and Pettigrew v. I.C.I. (Alkali), Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1936] A.C. 65; (1935) 52 Ll.L.Rep. 179 ... ..	255
<i>Hiscock</i> , In the Goods of ... ..	[1901] P. 78 ... ..	280
<i>Hoddinott v. Newton, Chambers &amp; Co., Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1901] A.C. 49 ... ..	144
<i>Holland and Another v. Hodgson and Another</i> ... ..	(1872) L.R. 7 C.P. 328 ... ..	65
<i>Horton v. London Graving Dock Company, Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1951] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 389 ... ..	294
<i>Household Machines, Ltd. v. Cosmos Exporters, Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1947] K.B. 217 ... ..	348
<i>Hughes v. Metropolitan Railway Company</i> ... ..	(1877) 2 App. Cas. 439 ... ..	527
<i>Huntoon Company v. Kolynos (Incorporated)</i> ... ..	[1930] 1 Ch. 528 ... ..	183
<i>Hurst</i> , The ... ..	[1952] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 96 ... ..	548
<i>Hussey v. Horne-Payne and Another</i> ... ..	(1879) 4 App. Cas. 311 ... ..	71, 407
<i>Indermaur v. Dames</i> ... ..	(1866) L.R. 1 C.P. 274; (1867) L.R. 2 C.P. 311 ... ..	294, 325
<i>Itter</i> , (Decd.), In the Goods of ... ..	[1950] P. 130 ... ..	280
<i>Jersey</i> , The ... ..	[1942] P. 119; 73 Ll.L.Rep. 20 ... ..	104
<i>Johnson v. Taylor Bros. &amp; Co., Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1920] A.C. 144 ... ..	390
<i>Jones v. South-West Lancashire Coal Owners' Association, Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1927] A.C. 827; 28 Ll.L.Rep. 259 ... ..	17
<i>Julia</i> , The ... ..	[1949] A.C. 293; 82 Ll.L.Rep. 270 ... ..	390
<i>King, The v. Greig and Heriot; Ex parte Beavan and Sinclair</i> ... ..	[1944] Vict. L.R. 66 ... ..	431
<i>— v. Inhabitants of Leake</i> ... ..	(1833) 5 B. & Ad. 469 ... ..	335
<i>Koursh, The</i> ... ..	[1924] P. 140; 18 Ll.L.Rep. 228 ... ..	159
<i>Lang v. Brown</i> ... ..	(1855) 25 L.T. (o.s.) 297 ... ..	330
<i>Last v. London Assurance Corporation</i> ... ..	(1885) 10 App. Cas. 438 ... ..	17
<i>Lay</i> , (Decd.), In the Goods of ... ..	(1840) 2 Curt. 375 ... ..	280
<i>Lebeaupin v. Richard Crispin &amp; Co.</i> ... ..	[1920] 2 K.B. 714; 4 Ll.L.Rep. 122 385, 456 ... ..	456
<i>Lemington</i> , The ... ..	(1874) 2 Asp. 475 ... ..	104
<i>Liesbosch (Owners) v. Edison (Owners)</i> ... ..	[1933] A.C. 449; 45 Ll.L.Rep. 123 ... ..	348
<i>Lilley v. Doubleday</i> ... ..	(1881) 7 Q.B.D. 510 ... ..	367
<i>Liver Alkali Company v. Johnson</i> ... ..	(1874) L.R. 9 Ex. 338 ... ..	197
<i>Lochgelly Iron and Coal Company, Ltd. v. M'Mullan</i> ... ..	[1934] A.C. 1 ... ..	266
<i>London and North Eastern Railway Company v. Berriman</i> ... ..	[1946] A.C. 278 ... ..	144
<i>London and North Western Railway Company v. Neilson</i> ... ..	[1922] 2 A.C. 263 ... ..	367
<i>London, Chatham and Dover Railway Company v. South Eastern Railway Company</i> ... ..	[1893] A.C. 429 ... ..	348
<i>M'Murdo</i> , In the Goods of ... ..	(1867) L.R. 1 P. & D. 540 ... ..	280
<i>Madeleine Vionnet et Cie. v. Wills</i> ... ..	[1940] 1 K.B. 72 ... ..	456
<i>Makin, Ltd. v. London and North Eastern Railway Company</i> ... ..	[1943] 1 K.B. 467 ... ..	38
<i>Marpessa</i> , The ... ..	[1907] A.C. 241 ... ..	467
<i>Mediana</i> , The ... ..	[1900] A.C. 113 ... ..	467
<i>Mehmet Dogan Bey v. G. G. Abdeni &amp; Co., Ltd.</i> ... ..	[1951] 2 K.B. 405; [1951] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 433 ... ..	297

CASES CITED—*continued*.

PAGE

<i>Mendip Range</i> (Owners) v. Radcliffe ...	[1921] 1 A.C. 556; 6 Ll.L.Rep. 375 ...	38
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board v. Coggins & Griffith (Liverpool), Ltd., and Another	[1947] A.C. 1; (1946) 79 Ll.L.Rep. 569	104
<i>Metagama</i> , The ...	(1927) 29 Ll.L.Rep. 253 ...	38, 470
Meyer and Others v. Dresser ...	(1864) 10 L.T. 610 ...	197
Monarch Steamship Company, Ltd. v. A/B Karlshamns Oljefabriker	[1949] A.C. 196; (1948) 82 Ll.L.Rep. 137 ...	297
Monroe Brothers, Ltd. v. Ryan ...	[1935] 2 K.B. 28; 51 Ll.L.Rep. 179 ...	485
Morris v. Barron ...	[1918] A.C. 1 ...	527
Muhammad Issa el Sheikh Ahmad and Another v. Ali and Others	[1947] A.C. 414 ...	348
Municipal Mutual Insurance, Ltd. v. Hills ...	(1932) 16 T.C. 430; 42 Ll.L.Rep. 173 ...	17
Nelson Line (Liverpool), Ltd. v. James Nelson & Sons, Ltd.	[1908] A.C. 16 ...	485
New York Life Insurance Company v. Styles ...	(1889) 14 App. Cas. 381; 2 T.C. 460 ...	17
<i>Niobe</i> , The ...	(1888) 13 P.D. 55 ...	197
Nouvion v. Freeman ...	(C.A.) (1887) 37 Ch.D. 244; (H.L.) (1889) 15 App. Cas. 1 ...	456
<i>Oropesa</i> , The ...	[1943] P. 32; (1942) 74 Ll.L.Rep. 86 ...	38
<i>P. Caland</i> , The ...	[1892] P. 191; [1893] A.C. 207 ...	38
Panoutsos v. Raymond Hadley Corporation of New York	[1917] 2 K.B. 473 ...	527
<i>Pass of Ballater</i> , The ...	[1942] P. 112; 72 Ll.L.Rep. 187 ...	104
Paterson Steamships, Ltd. v. Robin Hood Mills, Ltd.	(1937) 58 Ll.L.Rep. 33 ...	266
Paterson Zochonis & Co., Ltd. v. Elder Dempster & Co., Ltd., and Others	[1923] 1 K.B. 420; (1922) 13 Ll.L.Rep. 513 ...	485
Patterson, In the Goods of ...	(1898) 79 L.T. 123 ...	280
Pavia & Co., S.P.A. v. Thurmann-Nielsen ...	[1951] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 328; (C.A.) [1952] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 153; [1952] 1 All E.R. 492 ...	226, 348, 527
Perry v. Suffields, Ltd. ...	[1916] 2 Ch. 187 ...	71
Phoenix Insurance Company and Others v. De Monchy Rzn. and Others	(1929) 34 Ll.L.Rep. 201; 35 Com. Cas. 67 ...	12
Polemis and Furness, Withy & Co., Ltd., <i>In re</i>	[1921] 3 K.B. 560; 8 Ll.L.Rep. 351 ...	318
Pordage v. Cole ...	(1669) 1 Wms. Saund. 548 ...	183
<i>Quickstep</i> , The ...	(1890) 15 P.D. 196 ...	197
Ransohoff & Wissler v. Burrell ...	(1897) 35 Sc. L.R. 229 ...	430
Rathbone Brothers & Co. v. D. MacIver, Sons & Co.	[1903] 2 K.B. 378 ...	485
Rickards, Ltd. v. Oppenheim ...	[1950] 1 K.B. 616 ...	527
Rio Tinto Company v. The Crown ...	(1922) 10 Ll.L.Rep. 821 ...	71
<i>Ripon City</i> , The ...	[1897] P. 226 ...	104
<i>Roberta</i> , The ...	(1937) 58 Ll.L.Rep. 159 ...	104
Robertson v. Amazon Tug and Lighterage Company	(1881) 7 Q.B.D. 598 ...	197
Rossdale v. Denny ...	[1921] 1 Ch. 57 ...	71
Rossiter and Others v. Miller ...	(1878) 3 App. Cas. 1124 ...	71
Samuel v. Edinburgh & Glasgow Railway Company	(1850) 13 D. 312 ...	197
Scott v. Bevan ...	(1831) 2 B. & Ad. 78 ...	456

## CASES CITED—continued.

PAGE

Sea and Land Securities, Ltd. v. William Dickinson & Co., Ltd.	[1942] 2 K.B. 65; 72 Ll.L.Rep. 159 ...	197
Sharpe & Co., Ltd. v. Nosawa & Co. ...	[1917] 2 K.B. 814 ...	379
Snark, The ...	[1900] P. 105 ...	104
Spaight v. Tedcastle ...	(1881) 6 App. Cas. 217 ...	197
Standard Oil Company of New York v. Clan Line Steamers, Ltd.	[1924] A.C. 100; (1923) 17 Ll.L.Rep. 120 ...	266
Stanley, In the Estate of ...	[1916] P. 192 ...	280
Susquehanna, The ...	[1926] A.C. 655; 25 Ll.L.Rep. 205 ...	467
Symes and Jaywick Associated Properties, Ltd. v. Essex Rivers Catchment Board	[1937] 1 K.B. 548 ...	335
Szymonowski & Co. v. Beck & Co. ...	[1923] 1 K.B. 457; (1922) 14 Ll.L.Rep. 84; [1924] A.C. 43; (1923) 17 Ll.L.Rep. 97 ...	87
Tamvaco v. Timothy and Green (Union Lighterage Company, Third Parties)	(1882) Cab. & E. 1 ...	197
Tennants (Lancashire), Ltd. v. C. S. Wilson & Co., Ltd.	(1917) 23 Com. Cas. 41 ...	385
Tennent v. Earl of Glasgow ...	(1864) 2 M. (H.L.) 22 ...	197
Thomas & Co., Ltd. v. Portsea Steamship Company, Ltd.	[1912] A.C. 1 ...	12
Thurogood v. Van Den Berghs & Jurgens, Ltd.	[1951] 2 K.B. 537 ...	318, 399
Ticonderoga, The ...	(1857) Swab. 215 ...	104
Tollitt v. Saunders ...	(1821) 147 Eng. Rep. 198; 9 Price 612 ...	330
Trans Trust S.P.R.L. v. Danubian Trading Company, Ltd.	[1952] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 348; [1952] 1 All E.R. 970 ...	527
Travers & Sons, Ltd. v. Cooper ...	[1915] 1 K.B. 73 ...	197
Trinity House v. Clark ...	(1815) 4 M. & S. 288 ...	197
Truculent, H.M.S. ...	[1951] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 308 ...	104, 266
Turner v. Civil Service Supply Association, Ltd.	[1926] 1 K.B. 50 ...	197
Tweedale, In the Goods of ...	(1874) L.R. 3 P. & D. 204 ...	280
Tynedale Steam Shipping Company, Ltd. v. Anglo-Soviet Shipping Company, Ltd.	(1936) 41 Com. Cas. 206; 54 Ll.L.Rep. 341 ...	485
United Mills Agencies, Ltd. v. Harvey, Bray & Co. Utopia, The ...	[1951] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 631 ...	232
	[1893] A.C. 492 ...	104
Victoria Laundry (Windsor), Ltd. v. Newman Industries, Ltd.	[1949] 2 K.B. 528 ...	348
von Hatzfeldt-Wildenburg v. Alexander ...	[1912] 1 Ch. 284 ...	71
Wallis v. Smith ...	(1882) 21 Ch.D. 243 ...	348
Wear, The ...	(1925) 23 Ll.L.Rep. 59 ...	470
Weaver v. Commercial Process Company, Ltd., and Others	(1947) 63 T.L.R. 466 ...	255
Weir v. Union Steamship Company, Ltd. ...	[1900] A.C. 525 ...	197
West Cock, The ...	[1911] P. 208 ...	367
Westminster City Council v. Southern Railway Company	[1936] A.C. 511 ...	65
Whitby v. Burt, Boulton and Hayward, Ltd., and Another	(1947) 63 T.L.R. 458 ...	255
Wicks v. Cox ...	(1847) 11 Jur. 542 ...	330
Wilsons & Clyde Coal Company, Ltd. v. English Windschuegl, Ltd. v. Alexander Pickering & Co., Ltd.	[1938] A.C. 57 ...	266, 318, 399
	(1950) 84 Ll.L.Rep. 89 ...	242
Wingham, (Decd.), In re ...	[1949] P. 187 ...	280
Winter v. Cardiff Rural District Council ...	[1950] 1 All E.R. 819 ...	318, 399
Wood v. Gossage ...	[1921] P. 194 ...	280
— v. Walsh & Sons ...	[1899] 1 Q.B. 1009 ...	144
York, The ...	[1929] P. 178; 33 Ll.L.Rep. 241 ...	467

## STATUTES CONSIDERED.

	PAGE
<b>UNITED KINGDOM—</b>	
ARBITRATION ACT, 1950.	
Sect. 8 (2) ... ..	330
CROWN PROCEEDINGS ACT, 1947.	
Sect. 2 (1) ... ..	104
Sect. 40 (2) ... ..	104
LAND DRAINAGE ACT, 1930.	
Sect. 4 ... ..	335
LAW REFORM (CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE) ACT, 1945.	
Sect. 1 ... ..	159
Sect. 4 ... ..	159
LAW REFORM (MARRIED WOMEN AND TORTFEASORS) ACT, 1935.	
Sect. 6 ... ..	159
LICENSING ACT, 1921.	
Sect. 4 ... ..	137
MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.	
Sect. 503 ... ..	266
PORT OF LONDON (CONSOLIDATION) ACT, 1920.	
Sect. 155 (5) ... ..	96, 548
ROAD TRAFFIC ACT, 1930.	
Sect. 1 ... ..	483
SALE OF GOODS ACT, 1893.	
Sect. 14 (1) ... ..	562
Sect. 51 (3) ... ..	379
Sect. 53 (3) ... ..	562
SEWERS ACT, 1833.	
Sect. 47 ... ..	335
WILLS ACT, 1837.	
Sect. 7 ... ..	280
Sect. 11 ... ..	280, 292
WILLS (SOLDIERS AND SAILORS) ACT, 1918.	
Sect. 1 ... ..	280
Sect. 2 ... ..	280
 <b>AUSTRALIA—</b>	
NATIONAL SECURITY ACT, 1939-1943 ... ..	431
 <b>CANADA—</b>	
EXCHEQUER COURT ACT, 1927 ... ..	1
 <b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—</b>	
CARRIAGE OF GOODS BY SEA ACT, 1936.	
Sect. 3 (8) ... ..	520
Sect. 4 (2) ... ..	520
HARTER ACT, 1893.	
Sect. 3 ... ..	520



# CONTENTS

**NOTE:—These Reports should be cited as  
“[1952] 1 Lloyd’s Rep.”**

	PAGE
A/S Sameiling v. Grain Importers (Eire), Ltd. — [Q.B.] ...	313
Admiralty and Others:—Thomas Stone (Shipping), Ltd. v. —	
[Adm.] ... .. 38, 104,	367
<i>Albion</i> , The — [Adm.] ... .. 38, 104,	367
Amos & Smith, Ltd., and Another:—Taylor v. — [Leeds Assizes]	144
Anglo-Overseas Transport Company, Ltd. v. David Zanellotti, Ltd.	
— [Q.B.] ... .. 232	
Antwerp Steamship Company, Ltd.:—Sullivan v. — [Q.B.] ...	555
Arlington Overseas Trading Company:—Westminster Bank, Ltd.	
v. — [K.B.] ... .. 211	
Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company and Others:—United States	
of America v. — [U.S. Sup. Ct.] ... .. 520	
Australian Wheat Board:—Ministry of Food v. — [Q.B.] ...	297
Beauchamp v. Turrell — [Q.B.] ... .. 266	
<i>Beaverdell</i> , The — [Adm.] ... .. 421	
Bell and Another v. Martin — [K.B. (Div. Ct.)] ... .. 137	
Besse & Co. (London), Ltd.:—Société d’Avancés Commerciales	
(London), Ltd. v. — [Q.B.] ... .. 242	
<i>Bharatkhand</i> , The — [Adm.] ... .. 470	
Blow, Ltd.:—Henderson & Liddell, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.] ... .. 430	
Board of Trade. <i>See</i> Minister of Materials.	
Bradley Forge & Engineering Company, Ltd.:—Spalding v. —	
[Q.B.] ... .. 461	
Bradshaw v. Davey — [K.B. (Div. Ct.)] ... .. 65	
Brauer & Co. (Great Britain), Ltd. v. James Clark (Brush	
Materials), Ltd. — [Q.B.] ... .. 385	
Brennan and Others v. Carlton Steamship Company, Ltd., and	
Another — [C.A.] ... .. 343	
British Italian Trading Company, Ltd.:—Produce Brokers New	
Company (1924), Ltd. v. — [Q.B.] ... .. 379	
Bullman v. Gee Stevedoring Company, Ltd. — [M. & C.L. Ct.]	79
Bustard & Sons, Ltd.:—Evans v. — [C.A.] ... .. 81	

CONTENTS—*continued.*

	PAGE
Cambay Steamship Company, Ltd., and Another:—Brennan and Others v. — [C.A.] ... ..	343
Campbell v. Port of London Authority — [Q.B.] ... ..	399
Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd. v. The King — [P.C.] ... ..	1
Carlton Steamship Company, Ltd., and Another:—Brennan and Others v. — [C.A.] ... ..	343
Carmel Exporters & Importers, Ltd.:—East India Trading Company, Incorporated v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	456
Central Meat Products Company, Ltd. v. J. V. McDaniel, Ltd. — [Q.B.] ... ..	562
Cerrito v. North Eastern Timber Importers, Ltd. — [Q.B.] ... ..	330
Chambers Wharf and Cold Stores, Ltd.:—Pipe v. — [K.B.] ... ..	194
Clark (Brush Materials), Ltd.:—Brauer & Co. (Great Britain), Ltd. v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	385
Coleclough:—Wilson v. — [Probate] ... ..	292
Colin & Shields v. W. Weddel & Co., Ltd. — [Q.B.] ... ..	390
Compagnie d'Assurances Générales l'Helvetia:—MacLeod Ross & Co., Ltd. v. — [C.A.] ... ..	12
Continental Imes, Ltd. v. H. E. Dibble — [K.B.] ... ..	220
Cork Insulation & Asbestos, Ltd. v. Mackintosh & Co. (Gibraltar), Ltd. — [Gibraltar Sup. Ct.] ... ..	197
Danubian Trading Company, Ltd.:—Trans Trust S.P.R.L. v. — [C.A.] ... ..	348
Davey:—Bradshaw v. — [K.B. (Div. Ct.)] ... ..	65
Davidsons (Manchester), Ltd.:—Plasticmoda Societa per Azioni v. — [C.A.] ... ..	527
Den Norske Middelhavslinje, A/S, and Another:—Wenborn v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	255
Dibble:—Continental Imes, Ltd. v. — [K.B.] ... ..	220
Drinkwater and Another v. Kimber — [C.A.] ... ..	159
East India Trading Company, Incorporated v. Carmel Exporters & Importers, Ltd. — [Q.B.] ... ..	456
Ellerman's Wilson Line, Ltd. v. Webster — [K.B. (Div. Ct.)] ... ..	179
— and Another:—Taylor v. — [Leeds Assizes] ... ..	144
Ernesto (Owners):—Edmund Handcock (1929), Ltd. v. — [C.A.] ... ..	467
Essex Rivers Catchment Board:—Hunwick v. — [Chelmsford Assizes] ... ..	335
Evans v. Frank Bustard & Sons, Ltd. — [C.A.] ... ..	81
Fairclough Dodd & Jones, Ltd.:—Knotz v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	226
Faulconbridge (Inspector of Taxes) v. National Employers' Mutual General Insurance Association, Ltd. — [Ch.] ... ..	17
France Fenwick Tyne and Wear Company, Ltd., and Others:—Thomas Stone (Shipping), Ltd. v. — [Adm.] ... ..	38, 104, 367

CONTENTS—*continued*.

	PAGE
Gee Stevedoring Company, Ltd. :—Bullman v. — [M. & C.L. Ct.]	79
Grain Importers (Eire), Ltd. :—A/S Sameiling v. — [Q.B.]	313
Green v. New Zealand Shipping Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	318
Handcock (1929), Ltd. v. <i>Ernesto</i> (Owners) — [C.A.]	467
Harland & Wolff, Ltd., and Another :—Wenborn v. — [Q.B.]	255
Henderson & Liddell, Ltd. v. N. B. Blow, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	430
Higgins v. Racecourse Betting Control Board — [K.B.]	294
Howlett :—Lawrence v. — [Q.B. (Div. Ct.)]	483
<i>Humbergate</i> , The — [Adm.]	168
Hunwick v. Essex Rivers Catchment Board — [Chelmsford Assizes]	335
<i>Hurst</i> , The — [Adm.]	96
Hvalfangerselskapet Polaris A/S. <i>See</i> Polaris A/S.	
Innes and Another v. Martin — [K.B. (Div. Ct.)]	137
Inspector of Taxes. <i>See</i> Faulconbridge.	
Kimber :—Drinkwater and Another v. — [C.A.]	159
King, The :—Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd. v. — [P.C.]	1
Knotz v. Fairclough Dodd & Jones, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	226
Lange Bell & Co., Ltd. :—Waterhouse v. — [K.B.]	140
Lawrence v. Howlett — [Q.B. (Div. Ct.)]	483
Lerer v. Pridavok — [K.B.]	181
Loughborough v. Rowland & Marwood's Steamship Company, Ltd. — [C.A.]	542
McDaniel, Ltd. :—Central Meat Products Company, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.]	562
Machado & Co., Ltd. :—Yelo v. — [Q.B.]	183
Mackintosh & Co. (Gibraltar), Ltd. :—Cork Insulation & Asbestos, Ltd. v. — [Gibraltar Sup. Ct.]	197
MacLeod Ross & Co., Ltd. v. Compagnie d'Assurances Générales l'Helvetia — [C.A.]	12
McNulty & Son and Others :—Thomas Stone (Shipping), Ltd. v. — [Adm.]	38, 104
Manchester Ship Canal Company :—Martin v. — [C.A.]	539
Martin :—Bell and Another v. — [K.B. (Div. Ct.)]	137
— v. Manchester Ship Canal Company — [C.A.]	539
Minister of Materials (Board of Trade) v. Steel Brothers & Co., Ltd. — [C.A.]	87
— v. Wold Steamship Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.]	485
Ministry of Food v. Australian Wheat Board — [Q.B.]	297

CONTENTS—*continued.*

	PAGE
National Employers' Mutual General Insurance Association, Ltd.:—Faulconbridge (Inspector of Taxes) v. — [Ch.] ...	17
New Zealand Shipping Company, Ltd.:—Green v. — [Q.B.] ...	318
Newland, Decd., In the Estate of — [Probate] ...	280
North Eastern Timber Importers, Ltd.:—Cerrito v. — [Q.B.] ...	330
Pavia & Co., S.P.A. v. Thurmman-Nielsen — [C.A.] ...	153
Peninsular & Oriental Steam Navigation Company and Another:—Pike v. — [Q.B.] ...	431
Pike v. Waldrum and Another — [Q.B.] ...	431
Pipe v. Chambers Wharf and Cold Stores, Ltd. — [K.B.] ...	194
Plasticmoda Società per Azioni v. Davidsons (Manchester), Ltd. — [C.A.] ...	527
Polaris A/S, Hvalfangerselskapet:—Sociedade Portuguesa de Navios Tanques Limitada v. — [K.B.] ...	71
— [C.A.] ...	407
Port of London Authority:—Campbell v. — [Q.B.] ...	399
— Verrall v. — [Q.B.] ...	503
Pridavok:—Lerer v. — [K.B.] ...	181
Produce Brokers New Company (1924), Ltd. v. British Italian Trading Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.] ...	379
Racecourse Betting Control Board:—Higgins v. — [K.B.] ...	294
Rinovia Steam Fishing Company, Ltd.:—Sutherland v. — [C.A.] ...	157
Road Haulage Executive:—Robert Shearer, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.] ...	512
Rowland & Marwood's Steamship Company, Ltd.:—Loughborough v. — [C.A.] ...	542
Salford City, The — [Adm.] ...	273
Sameiling, A/S. <i>See</i> A/S Sameiling.	
Shearer, Ltd. v. Road Haulage Executive — [Q.B.] ...	512
Sociedade Portuguesa de Navios Tanques Limitada v. Hvalfangerselskapet Polaris A/S — [K.B.] ...	71
— [C.A.] ...	407
Société d'Avances Commerciales (London), Ltd. v. A. Besse & Co. (London), Ltd. — [Q.B.] ...	242
Spalding v. Bradley Forge & Engineering Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.] ...	461
Steel Brothers & Co., Ltd.:—Minister of Materials (Board of Trade) v. — [C.A.] ...	87
Stone (Shipping), Ltd. v. The Admiralty and Others — [Adm.] ...	38, 104, 367
Sullivan v. Antwerp Steamship Company, Ltd. — [Q.B.] ...	555

CONTENTS—*continued.*

	PAGE
Sutherland v. Rinovia Steam Fishing Company, Ltd. — [C.A.]	157
Swan, Hunter, and Wigham Richardson, Ltd., and Others:— Thomas Stone (Shipping), Ltd. v. — [Adm.] ... ..	38, 104, 367
Taylor v. Ellerman's Wilson Line, Ltd., and Another — [Leeds Assizes] ... ..	144
<i>Thalatta</i> , The — [Adm.] ... ..	358
Thurmann-Nielsen:—Pavia & Co., S.P.A. v. — [C.A.] ... ..	153
Trans Trust S.P.R.L. v. Danubian Trading Company, Ltd. — [C.A.] ... ..	348
<i>Trivia</i> , The — [Adm.] ... ..	548
Turrell:—Beauchamp v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	266
United States of America v. Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company and Others — [U.S. Sup. Ct.] ... ..	520
Verrall v. Port of London Authority — [Q.B.] ... ..	503
Waldrum and Another:—Pike v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	431
Waterhouse v. H. Lange Bell & Co., Ltd. — [K.B.] ... ..	140
Webster:—Ellerman's Wilson Line, Ltd. v. — [K.B. (Div. Ct.)]	179
Weddel & Co., Ltd.:—Colin & Shields v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	390
Wenborn v. Harland & Wolff, Ltd., and Another — [Q.B.] ...	255
Westminster Bank, Ltd. v. Arlington Overseas Trading Company — [K.B.] ... ..	211
Wilson, Decd., In the Estate of — [Probate] ... ..	292
—— v. Coleclough — [Probate] ... ..	292
Wold Steamship Company, Ltd.:—Minister of Materials v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	485
Yelo v. Machado & Co., Ltd. — [Q.B.] ... ..	183
Zanellotti, Ltd.:—Anglo-Overseas Transport Company, Ltd. v. — [Q.B.] ... ..	232

# LLOYD'S LIST LAW REPORTS

Editor : H. P. HENLEY

Of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

Assistant Editor : E. S. MATHERS

Of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law

[1952] VOL. 1]

FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 1952.

[PART 1

## JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Nov. 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 1951.

CANADA STEAMSHIP LINES, LTD.  
v. THE KING.

Before Lord PORTER, Lord NORMAND,  
Lord MORTON OF HENRYTON, Lord  
ASQUITH OF BISHOPSTONE and Lord  
COHEN.

**Contract—Lease—Exemption from liability clause  
—Indemnity clause—Negligence of lessor's  
servants causing fire on demised premises—  
Destruction of property belonging to lessees  
and to third parties—Liability of lessor—  
Right of lessor to indemnity—Construction of  
lease—*Faute lourde*.**

Lease entered into between plaintiffs and Crown whereby there was demised to plaintiffs for a term of years a parcel of land situated on the western side of St. Gabriel Basin of Lachine Canal, Montreal, together with the right to occupy and use freight shed—Terms of lease:

7. That the lessee shall not have any claim or demand against the lessor for detriment, damage or injury of any nature to the said land, the said shed, the said platform and the said canopy, or to any motor or other vehicles, materials, supplies, goods, articles, effects or things at any time brought, placed, made or being upon the said land, the said platform or in the said shed.

17. That the lessee shall at all times indemnify and save harmless the lessor from and against all claims and demands, loss, costs, damages, actions, suits or other proceedings by whomsoever made, brought or prosecuted, in any manner based upon, occasioned by

or attributable to the execution of these presents, or any action taken or things done or maintained by virtue hereof, or the exercise in any manner of rights arising hereunder.

Obligation upon Crown to "maintain the said shed"—Use of oxy-acetylene apparatus by servants of Crown to effect repairs to shed doors—Cotton waste set alight by sparks, fire spreading and destroying shed and contents—Claim brought by plaintiffs and other goods-owners (third parties) against Crown alleging *faute lourde* (gross negligence) of servants of Crown—Denial of negligence, with further plea that claim was in any event barred by terms of Clause 7—Alleged right of Crown under Clause 17 to be indemnified by plaintiffs in respect of third-party claims—Judgment entered by learned trial Judge in favour of plaintiffs on both claim and third-party issue—Appeal by Crown—Decision of Sup. Ct. of Canada that plaintiffs' claim was barred by Clause 7 of lease and that Crown was entitled to indemnity under Clause 17—Appeal by plaintiffs—Principles to be applied in construing clauses stipulating immunity from liability—Civil Code of Lower Canada, Arts. 1013-1021, 1612 (3), 1614, 1617, 1618, 1641, 1660—Canadian Exchequer Court Act, 1927.

—*Held*, by P.C., that, construing the wording of the lease in general and Clause 7 in particular, the Crown had failed to establish that it was intended to exempt it from liability in respect of the gross negligence of its servants; and, construing Clause 17, that (a) it was doubtful whether its words could be applied to a negligent act done in the course of carrying out the lessor's obligations under the lease; (b) even if Clause 17 embraced damage based on a negligent act, its wording was also wide enough to embrace damage arising from some ground other than negligence, and therefore, its meaning being far from clear, the Crown had failed to establish a right to indemnity in respect of the gross negligence of its

[1952] VOL. 1]

Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd. v. The King.

[P.C.]

servants—Appeal by plaintiffs allowed—  
Order of learned trial Judge restored.

—Alderslade v. Hendon Laundry,  
Ltd., [1945] 1 K.B. 189, applied.

The following cases were referred to:

Alderslade v. Hendon Laundry, Ltd.,  
[1945] 1 K.B. 189;  
Glengoil Steamship Company and Gray  
v. Pilkington and Others, (1897) 28  
S.C.R. 146.

This was an appeal, brought by special leave, by Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd., from six judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada, reversing in part a like number of judgments of the Exchequer Court of Canada (Angers, J.) which had maintained petitions of right against the Crown for damages arising out of a fire which, on May 5, 1944, destroyed a freight shed (described as the Ottawa Street Shed) occupied by the appellants under lease from the Crown on a wharf belonging to the Crown in the St. Gabriel Basin of the inner harbour of Montreal.

In the first of such cases, the appellants claimed from the Crown \$40,713.72 as the value of the property of the appellants destroyed in the fire. In the remaining five cases, the suppliants were owners of other property destroyed by the fire, viz., cargo in the hands of the appellants awaiting shipment, goods stored in the shed by special arrangement with the appellants, and motor vehicles and other property lawfully in or about the shed at the time of the fire. The suppliants in these five cases and the amounts respectively claimed by them from the Crown were as follows:—

H. J. Heinz Company of Canada, Ltd. ...	38,430.88	dols.
Canada and Dominion Sugar Company, Ltd. ...	108,310.83	"
W. H. Taylor, Ltd. ...	3,670.25	"
Raymond Copping ...	1,662.37	"
Cunningham & Wells, Ltd. ...	15,159.83	"
	167,234.16	"

In each of the six cases, which were tried together before the Exchequer Court of Canada, the trial Judge maintained the suppliants' petition of right against the

Crown, and condemned the latter to pay the damages claimed, the amount of which was admitted. In the five cases other than that in which the appellants were suppliants the trial Judge also dismissed third-party proceedings instituted by the Crown seeking indemnity from the appellants.

The Crown then entered a consolidated appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, which, while upholding the judgment of the trial Judge in favour of the suppliants other than the appellants, reversed his decision so far as they related to the appellants' own claim and to the third-party proceedings for indemnity brought by the Crown against the appellants in respect of the claims of the other suppliants.

The appellants were a steamship company engaged (*inter alia*) in the transport of cargo from Montreal to various ports on the Great Lakes. In order to secure facilities for the loading, discharging and delivery of cargo at Montreal in the conduct of its business, the appellants leased from the Crown space on one of the latter's wharves in the St. Gabriel Basin of the inner harbour of Montreal, together with a large freight shed erected thereon. The relevant clauses of the lease, which was dated Nov. 18, 1940, were as follows:

1. That the lessee will pay all rental herein reserved at the time and in the manner in these presents set forth, without any abatement or deduction whatever.

5. That the lessor, his servants or agents, shall, at all times and for all purposes, have full and free access to any and every part of the said land, the said shed and the said platform.

6. That the said land shall be used for purposes in connection with the lessee's business, only, and for no other purpose or purposes whatever.

7. That the lessee shall not have any claim or demand against the lessor for detriment, damage or injury of any nature to the said land, the said shed, the said platform and the said canopy, or to any motor or other vehicles, materials, supplies, goods, articles, effects or things at any time brought, placed, made or being upon the said land, the said platform or in the said shed.

8. That the lessor will, at all times during the currency of this lease, at his

own cost and expense, maintain the said shed, exclusive of the said platform and the said canopy.

9. That the lessee shall, in addition to the payment of the yearly rental hereunder, at its own sole cost and expense, insure, concurrently with the execution of this lease or as soon thereafter as possible, and thereafter keep insured during the currency of this lease with an insurance company or companies satisfactory to the Minister of Transport the said shed against fire and other casualty in the sum of forty-eight thousand dollars (\$48,000.000).

10. That the lessee shall, before constructing or erecting the said platform, the said canopy or other structures, including alterations to the said shed, on the said land, submit to the general superintendent plans or drawings showing the location and design and nature of construction of the said platform, the said canopy or such structures, and obtain his approval of such plans or drawings, and shall construct or erect the said platform, the said canopy or such structures on the location and in accordance with the designs as shown on the plans and drawings approved by the general superintendent, and thereafter maintain the said platform, the said canopy or such structures in accordance with the designs respecting the same, and shall carry on the work of such construction and maintenance of the said platform, the said canopy and such structures at its own cost and expense and under the control and direction of the general superintendent and to his entire satisfaction.

12. That it is distinctly understood and agreed that this lease is granted subject to the condition that the said platform and the said canopy shall forthwith, upon termination of this lease in any manner, except as provided for in Clause 18 hereof, be and become vested in title in the lessor without any payment of compensation to the lessee in respect of the said platform and the said canopy.

16. That the parcel or tract of land, thirty (30) feet in width, situated between St. Gabriel Basin No. 2 and the said land may be used by the lessee in common with the public generally, it being understood and agreed, however, that the lessee shall,

in the discretion of the superintending engineer and in accordance with his direction, have preference in the use thereof.

17. That the lessee shall at all times indemnify and save harmless the lessor from and against all claims and demands, loss, costs, damages, actions, suits or other proceedings by whomsoever made, brought or prosecuted, in any manner based upon, occasioned by or attributable to the execution of these presents, or any action taken or things done or maintained by virtue hereof, or the exercise in any manner of rights arising hereunder.

Some five or six days prior to the fire in question the appellants' shed foreman had made complaint in general terms to the Superintendent of the Lachine Canal, under whose jurisdiction the shed in question fell, regarding the condition of the doors of the shed, a number of which required repairs. On May 5, 1944, the day of the fire, servants of the Crown, without further reference to the appellants, were effecting repairs to such doors, the work undertaken by them and the manner of its being carried out being entirely without reference to the appellants or their employees. The shed in question was completely full of a great variety of merchandise awaiting shipment, in addition to which it contained other goods stored by third parties by special arrangement with the appellants and a large quantity of cargo-handling, office and other equipment belonging to the appellants. There were also a number of trucks and motor vehicles on the wharf delivering or about to deliver further goods for transport.

The shed in question was constructed of corrugated iron on a steel frame and the shipping doors were hung on hinges bolted to the uprights of such frame. These uprights were in the form of steel "H-beams," the flanges of which were  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  in. thick. The Crown's employees, having almost completed their work on the afternoon of the day in question, had removed and straightened the upper hinge of one of the shipping doors which had to be replaced. These hinges had originally been affixed to the "H-beam" with  $\frac{3}{4}$ -in. bolts. When they came to replace the hinge in question they found that they had no  $\frac{3}{4}$ -in. bolts with them, the smallest size being  $\frac{1}{2}$  in. in diameter. Instead of securing a bolt of the proper size they elected to enlarge



the  $\frac{3}{8}$ -in. hole in the "H-beam" so that it would take the  $\frac{1}{2}$ -in. bolt. Inside the door immediately opposite and approximately 3 ft. distant from the "H-beam" in question were piled a number of bales of cotton waste. Having decided to enlarge the holes as aforesaid, the Crown's employees, instead of using an electric or hand drill or reamer for the purpose, an operation which would have taken about a minute and could have been carried out with perfect safety, elected to make use of an oxy-acetylene cutting torch which they happened to have at hand. The operation of enlarging the hole involved using the torch for a matter of three or four minutes. Sparks escaped into the shed and bales of cotton waste caught fire. The flames spread rapidly to the other contents of the shed and consumed the whole.

The learned trial Judge found as a fact that the fire and resulting damages were caused by the gross negligence (*faute lourde*) of the Crown's servants while acting within the scope of their duties or employment.

The Crown's case was based primarily upon a denial of negligence. In addition, so far as the appellants' claim was concerned, the Crown pleaded that the claim was in any event barred by the provisions of Clause 7 of the lease. In the third-party proceedings the Crown relied upon Clause 17 of the lease as giving rise to a right of indemnity from the appellants.

The learned trial Judge, Angers, J., basing himself on the law of Quebec, found that no clause would extend to relieve the Crown of liability for damages resulting from the gross negligence (*faute lourde*) of its servants. He accordingly refused to adopt Clause 7 as a bar to the appellants' action or to hold that Clause 17 gave the Crown a right to indemnity in the other five cases. In the result, he condemned the Crown to pay to the appellants and to the other five suppliants the damages respectively claimed by them, and he dismissed the third-party proceedings brought by the Crown against the appellants.

The Supreme Court of Canada (Rinfret, C.J., Rand, Kellock, Estey, Locke, Cartwright and Fauteux, J.J.) by a majority of six to one (Locke, J., dissenting) reversed the trial Judge in the appellants' own case and unanimously reversed the trial Judge

in the cases of the other five suppliants in so far as the third-party proceedings were concerned. The Supreme Court concurred in the finding of the trial Judge as to the negligence of the Crown's servants but refused to hold that such negligence amounted to *faute lourde*. Construing Clauses 7 and 17, they held that such clauses barred the action brought by Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd., and entitled the Crown to indemnity in the other actions.

Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd., now appealed.

The further facts and arguments are sufficiently set out in their Lordships' judgment.

Mr. Geoffrey Cross, K.C., Mr. Hazen Hansard, K.C. (Canadian Bar) and Mr. R. O. Wilberforce (instructed by Messrs. Lawrence Jones & Co.) appeared for the appellants; Mr. A. J. Campbell, K.C., and Mr. D. W. Mundell, K.C. (both Canadian Bar) and Mr. Frank Gahan (instructed by Messrs. Charles Russell & Co.) represented the Crown.

Judgment was reserved.

---

Monday, Jan. 21, 1952.

---

#### JUDGMENT.

**Lord MORTON OF HENRYTON:** It will be convenient to refer to the appellant company as "the company" and to the respondent as "the Crown."

This is an appeal by special leave from six judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada dated June 23, 1950, reversing in part a like number of judgments of the Exchequer Court of Canada (Angers, J.), which had maintained petitions of right against the Crown for damages arising out of a disastrous fire.

In the first of these six cases the company was suppliant, claiming from the Crown 40,713.72 dols. as the value of the property of the company destroyed in the fire. In the remaining five cases the suppliants were owners of other property destroyed by the fire. The suppliants in these five cases and