

the spectacle of conflicting evidence is only too common in courts of justice. It is enough, in the present case, to say that the evidence for the prosecution is overwhelming and irresistible. The allegation that the men were only clearing out their tangled lines, besides being inconsistent with the usage and habits of expert fishermen, is wholly insufficient to account for the actions of these men while on the rail, as seen and testified to by so many of the witnesses.

"I pronounce therefore, for the condemnation of the *A. H. Wonson*, her tackle, apparel, furniture, stores, and cargo, as forfeited under the Dominion Acts, and the same having been bailed at the appraised value of \$3,500; I direct that the amount shall be paid into court, to be distributed as directed by the Act of 1868. I pronounce also for the costs secured by the first bond, on the defence being put in."