

Wherefore the said claimants, Charles Spring & Co., pray that the said information may be dismissed with costs.

W. CLARK AND D. A. DINGLEY, *Proctors for Claimants.*

Which demurrer was overruled by the court.

On the same day was filed the following answer of claimants:—

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA.

UNITED STATES

vs.

CHARLES SPRING & Co., AND SCHOONER "ONWARD."

Answer.

The answer of Charles Spring & Co., claimants and owners of said schooner "Onward," her tackle, apparel, furniture and cargo, as the same are set forth in the information filed herein in behalf of the United States.

And now comes Charles Spring & Co., claimants as aforesaid and for answer to the said information against the said schooner "Onward," her tackle, apparel, furniture and cargo as set forth in said information says that the said schooner "Onward," her tackle, apparel, furniture and cargo as set forth in the information mentioned did not, nor did any part thereof become forfeited in manner and form as in said information in that behalf alleged, or at all.

Wherefore, the said claimants pray that said information be dismissed with costs to these claimants attached.

W. CLARK AND D. A. DINGLEY, *Proctors for Claimants.*

UNITED STATES, }
DISTRICT OF ALASKA. } SS.

Personally appeared before me, W. Clark, who being first duly sworn upon his oath, says:—

I am the duly authorized proctor for the claimants above named, that the foregoing answer is true as I verily believe. That the reason this affidavit is made by me and not by claimants, is because said claimants are non-residents and are absent from the District of Alaska.

(This was treated as subscribed and sworn to by Daniel Monroe, master.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this }
day of September, A. D. 1886. }

On 22nd September, 1886, were filed the following exceptions to answer:—

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF ALASKA, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

UNITED STATES

vs.

THE SCHOONER "ONWARD."—No. 49.

The said libellant hereby excepts to the sufficiency of the defendant's answer herein, on the following grounds:—

1st. Said answer is not properly or at all verified as required by rule 27 of the United States Admiralty rules.

2nd. Said answer is not full, explicit or distinct to each or any allegation of the libel herein, as required by said rule.