

The penalty for the crime is imprisonment in the Penitentiary for a period of from two years to life.

The confessed accomplice, Howard C. Thomas, confined in the County Jail since the commencement of the case (Feb'y, 1880) was, on the day after the completion of the trial, discharged from custody, a *not. pros.* having been entered by the counsel for the crown. The cost of the trial to the county was considerable, the hotel expenses amounting to \$1220.60.

The prosecution spared no expense in working up the case. Hall, one of the witnesses, was brought from Yokahama; Roberts was found in Ireland; Thomas was discovered in Nova Scotia, and Trisinski was got in Hoboken, N. J. Then Melian, the stevedore, was brought from Cuba, and an interpreter was brought from New York; and these people were under pay. Besides this, there are the expenses of Capt. Brown, who made investigation in Cuba, and the expenses of Mr. Cleveland who so successfully worked up the case here.

Press Comments.

The publisher subjoins for general interest a synopsis of the comments of the St. John Press the morning after the verdict was returned.

The length of the trial, the nature and character of the evidence, the able manner in which the case was conducted by the counsel for the different interests; the frequent and sharp collisions between the two principal counsel, the careful, patient and elaborate charge of the Chief Justice, and the grave results to the prisoner of conviction, have all conspired to invest the case with an extraordinary degree of interest. It was for a time, and perhaps to the last, believed by some that the jury would not agree, but a contrary opinion was strongly held by others, and was justified by the result. Those who followed the evidence in the case, though portions of it were not free from difficulties, and who listened to the charge of the Chief Justice, will not be surprised at the verdict. That the vessel was scuttled by order of the prisoner, few seemed to doubt, though owing to the conflict between the previous statements of Thomas and the evidence lately given by him, there were some who questioned if the scuttling took place in the way described. The verdict will be generally allowed to be in accord with the evidence. The surprising recommendation to mercy, is, we suppose, a mode of giving expression to those humane feelings which juries entertain. This is the only theory on which we can account for such a recommendation, for if a captain is believed to have feloniously scuttled his vessel, or caused it to be done, in order to defraud underwriters or others, he is surely a fit subject for very severe punishment. His conduct is criminal in the extreme.—*Daily Telegraph*.

The case is unexampled in duration in the criminal trials of the Province. Both Judge and Jury bore with extraordinary patience the wranglings of counsel as well as much dry argument * * * Judge Palmer's very clear and satisfactory evidence in regard to the insurances was particularly interesting. As to the verdict, it was probably no surprise to the prisoner after the Chief Justice's charge, which was adverse to the defence. The absence of any satisfactory explanation in regard to the receipt of large sums of money by Captain Tower from parties who were connected with the shipment, those have proved the real stumbling blocks to the defence in the case. * * * It really seemed for a time as if it was Judge Palmer whom the prosecution was endeavoring to try, and the Chief Justice had to remind the jury yesterday that they were not trying Judge Palmer, but Captain Tower.—*Daily Sun*.

The verdict in the scuttling case has been much commented on and discussed, and will probably continue to be a subject for discussion for some time to come. Its real scope was not understood at first. It is an undeniable fact that days and days of the long trial were occupied in attempts at implicating the chief owner. So slight was the apparent relevancy of the evidence adduced in these attempts to the case presented against Tower that its admission was a matter of surprise; and the conclusion of many on-lookers was that one of the main aims of the prosecution was the implication of the principal owner. The jury were compelled by the evidence submitted to them to consider the charges specific and implied against the owner. They found them untrue. Accepting the main evidence against Tower as credible, they felt forced to conclude him guilty of the chief charges against him. But they saw and could not help seeing that if their verdict against him should be coupled with no indication of their finding on the charges which the prosecution tried so hard to establish against Judge Palmer, the public would probably regard the verdict against Tower as a *quasi* verdict against the Judge. * * * The one part of their verdict is entitled to as much respect as the other. Each contains a conclusion arrived at under oath on the evidence submitted to them under the rulings of the presiding Judge. If their finding in regard to the chief owner was irrelevant, so was the evidence admitted against and for him.—*Daily News*.

1428
E