

WORKING WINTER

PROSPECTING AND MINING IN CAPE HOME COUNTRY. Reported Yield of Several of the Claims Worked in Cold Weather.

SEATTLE, Feb. 25.—Newspapers and private letters dated December 1, received here from Cape Nome via Dawson yesterday, say that considerable prospecting work has been done during the winter.

Contrary to the general opinion, it is believed that the best work will be done in the greater part of the winter without "digging" as is the case in the summer.

Several quartz ledges have been located along Anvil, one opposite No. 3, on the right bank, and another opposite No. 7, on the left bank.

Other claims on tributaries of Nome and Klondike rivers, of the Forest Grove, limited extent. Enough has been done, however, to warrant the belief that the work of next summer will reveal Eldorado and Bonanza by the score.

COLLEGE ATHLETICS MEET. Elect Officers and Make Certain Changes in Regulations. BALEM, Or., Feb. 25.—The representatives of the colleges of Oregon...

ROSEBURG RESIDENCE BURNED. Loss, \$2000.—Wreck of a Southern Pacific freight train. ROSEBURG, Feb. 25.—The residence of Mrs. J. Ball was destroyed by fire last night.

New Washington Incorporations. OLYMPIA, Feb. 25.—The following articles of incorporation have been filed with the secretary of state...

Died at the Asylum. BALEM, Feb. 25.—William R. Hayward, aged 61, died at the asylum today of consumption.

Oregon Notes. A saw mill with 150,000 feet daily capacity is to be built at Coles station, on the Oregon-California State line.

Successful Mining Company. Sumpter, \$30,000. Arthur Phillip, Eugene A. Higginson, Charles H. Chaney.

Supplemental articles were filed by two persons. The investment company which signed its name to the Taxpayers' Convention...

WATER FOR THE MINES

ASSURED BY HEAVY PRECIPITATION IN ROGUE RIVER VALLEY. Nearly Three Inches of Water in the Past Eight Days—Snow in the Higher Altitudes.

ASHLAND, Or., Feb. 25.—It has been raining heavily and steadily in Ashland and vicinity all day, there having been .64 of an inch precipitation during the last 10 hours, and it is still raining heavily.

Further Mail Improvement. Word reaches this city that the gap which now exists in the railway mail service between Ashland and Dunsmuir will be closed March 1, making a through service between Portland and San Francisco.

DeBoest's Arm Broken. Joseph DeBoest, whose home is in Portland, and who has been engaged as a freeman on the Southern Pacific, running between this city and Dunsmuir, met with an accident at Sissons last night.

Paul's Land Bill Favorably Reported. WASHINGTON, Feb. 25.—The Thomas Paul land bill has been favorably reported in the Senate. This bill was introduced this session by Senator Foster.

Republicans of Whitman County. COLEFAX, Feb. 25.—The Republican County Central Committee met in Colefax yesterday, 41 precincts of the 51 in the County being represented.

Accident to Goldsborough. SEATTLE, Feb. 25.—A builders' trial trip of the torpedo-boat-destroyer Goldsborough, resulted in an accident, which will delay the final builders' test six weeks.

Robbed of \$10 in a Den. SEATTLE, Feb. 25.—Charles Webb, who lives at 618 Jackson street, was struck on the head of a pistol and robbed of \$10 in gold in the Tenderloin district Saturday night.

Fusionists of Idaho. BLACKFOOT, Idaho, Feb. 25.—The Democratic, Silver-Republican and Populist committees met at Idaho Falls yesterday and declared for a union of all silver forces in the State.

Washington Notes. Ellensburg is soon to have a telephone exchange. George W. Hopp, of Tumwater, has been appointed postmaster at Cape York, Alaska.

Lessons of the Boer War. BERLIN, Feb. 25.—In German military circles it is believed that the lessons taught by the Boer war will make a large increase necessary in the German cavalry.

Memorial Sermon for Bishop Newman. WASHINGTON, Feb. 25.—At the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church today, Bishop John P. Hurs' preached a memorial sermon at a special service held in honor and remembrance of the late Bishop Newman.

AN INHUMAN TARIFF.

CONSEQUENCES DISCERNIBLE IN THE PUERTO RICO BILL. New York Evening Post. The humane policy of the United States cannot too soon be aroused to the fact that the republicans in congress are proposing to commit, in the name of the nation, an act of unparalleled and shameful cruelty.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

What are the facts? They are set forth in the minority report of Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, a republican who has the courage of his convictions, and who has the heart of a philanthropist.

PENSION CLAIM LAWYERS

COMMISSIONER REPLIES TO REPORT SENT TO MEMBERS. Shows How the Attorneys Receive Pay for Service They Never Perform—Change is Asked.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 21.—The following report by Commissioner of Pensions, H. Clay Evans, may prove of special interest to readers and their friends. The commissioner's report grew out of a statement made by a Washington City pension attorney, William Morris, which he sent to senators and members of congress.

The amendment to the pension law referred to by Mr. Morris is as follows: "Provided, that the commissioner of pensions shall furnish all necessary blanks to claimants, and the commissioner may, in his discretion, refuse to pay the fee to attorney of record when he is satisfied that said attorney failed to prepare the case under his or her personal supervision, and did not discharge his full duty to claimant."

"It will be noted that the provision does not abolish pension attorneys, nor does it deprive any such attorney of the legal fees for any service rendered or to be rendered by him personally. It merely authorizes the commissioner of pensions to refuse to pay an attorney for services not performed by him, but by some one else."

The filing of a pension claim is not attended with any costs, save the execution of the papers, and the consequence is that the Pension Bureau has been inundated with claims, many of which have no merit.

Again, these attorneys employ sub-agents who for a portion of the attorney fee supplement the work performed by the claimant and his comrades, and secure other testimony by circulars and letters, telling him that many others similarly situated are receiving large pensions, and that the Government is becoming more liberal in its policy.

When a pension claim is established, although it is secured by the Pension Bureau, the attorney of record has performed none of the services for which he was employed (save the furnishing of blank forms of affidavits to claimants, and frequent calls upon the Pension Bureau).

"A great many claims without merit are admitted and a great many of those claimants who have no title under the law believe themselves entitled to pensions granted to others no more entitled than themselves."

"The pension system as established by congress and administered by the Pension Bureau is in a better position to know the status of a claim and the evidence necessary to establish it than any other bureau of such a quality of which others who receive such bounty are induced to pay attorney fees to some one who has not performed the services for which he was employed."

"Except so far as a claimant needs assistance to secure and prepare the evidence in his case, the appointment of an attorney is not necessary to secure the bounty provided by the Government. It is, therefore, apparent that, provided the claimant can secure the preparation of affidavits and furnish the evidence in his case, he needs no attorney, if his case is a good one; but a doubtful claim or one without merit can be and often is advanced by an unscrupulous attorney or his sub-agent."

In summing up the case on behalf of the Pension Bureau, Mr. Evans offers some of Mr. Morris' letters soliciting business as a pension attorney.

Plates for German Navy. BERLIN, Feb. 25.—Admiral von Tirpitz, Secretary of the Admiralty, has informed the Reichstag budget committee that if the naval augmentation bill is adopted an order for steel plates to the value of \$2,000,000 must be given jointly to the Stumm Bros. and to Herr Krupp.

NEUTRALIZATION OR PROTECTION.

VIEW OF A RECOGNIZED AUTHORITY SUPPORTS THE ADMINISTRATION. Written for the New York Times by Theodore S. Woolsey, Professor of International Law, Yale University.

We do not always realize the several distinct problems which are involved in building a ship canal across Central America. There is first the physical engineering, problem—how to dig at least cost, with least rock and earth to move, with surest water supply, with least danger from floods, with best harbor, and with least loss of labor from climate.

Then there is the trade question. What route would best serve the commerce of the world? We are apt to think this, and to consider our own shores, our own convenience, merely. This is lawful, of course, but short-sighted, because we need the heaviest traffic possible to make it pay, and because if it fails to serve the world's commerce fitly another canal, over which we should have no control, would be entirely possible in course of time.

A third point to be considered is the concession under which the work is carried on. For the conditions laid down by one state may be so much more favorable than those of another as to more than make up for the disadvantages of the concession under which the work is carried on.

And, finally, there is the question of political status, for such a vast undertaking is quite beyond the capacity of any one American State. Sovereign rights, capital for the undertaking, and power to protect it, do not exist in the grasp of the same hand.

A commission is now at work investigating the first problem here enumerated. It is a commission of the United States, and its report will be made to congress before its work is made, such action would be wanting in respect to the president, and he is likely to forfeit the confidence of the country.

When a ship canal lies entirely within one state, and has been constructed by the agencies of that state, there is exclusive sovereignty over it; the interests of other states are involved. This Government can keep Russian warships out of the Kiel canal at pleasure.

But when capital of one state is used to dig a ship canal in another, the right of protection, only one of the privileges of construction, lest the work should be the sport of local political instability. Moreover, there is a third set of interests involved, namely, those of other commercial powers. No state today can afford to, or will, permit its trade to be handicapped unnecessarily, or its power in war to be limited by a treaty which gives a rival superior commercial or military privileges.

The problem then is not simply to lay down such a status as will satisfy the sovereignty of the canal company and the sovereignty of the territory to be canalized. It must also be acceptable to the trading powers of the world, for otherwise they would make remonstrance and trouble, not so much with the United States as with the smaller Nicaragua or United States of Columbia.

The status which is supposed to meet these various needs best is one which will secure entire freedom from all operations of war; that is, neutralization. Can this best be brought about and maintained by the action of only one of the powers involved, or by the action of all of them? Wharton, in his "Digest of the International Law of the United States," answers this question: "Neutralization is the assignment to a particular territory of a status which makes it a non-belligerent in respect to all future wars as will protect it from foreign belligerent disturbances. This quality can only be impressed by the action of the great powers by whom civilized wars are waged and by whose joint intervention such wars could be averted."

"This seemed a heavy price to pay for the exclusive military use of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be open to our enemy's warships as freely as to our own, while under a system of protection the United States must guard the canal, protect it from local disturbances, and must hold it subject to the attack of its own future enemies, a vulnerable point for a natural base. For clearly the second is to be assured by a slight concession to the United States of the canal, when the United States is a belligerent, and only then if it is strong enough to maintain this right. The essential difference between them is that under a system of neutralization the canal would be