

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH, ST. JOHN, N. B., SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1904.

St. John, N. B., July 30, 1904

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH
Published every Wednesday and Saturday
in a year, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.
The Telegraph Publishing Company, of
St. John, N. B., is the proprietor.
R. W. MOOREHEAD, Editor.
S. J. McGOVERN, Bus. Mgr.

ADVERTISING RATES
Ordinary commercial advertisements taking
the run of the paper, each insertion, \$1.00
per inch.
Advertisements of Wills, For Sale, etc.,
one cent a word for each insertion.
Notices of Births, Marriages and Deaths
one cent for each insertion.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.
All remittances must be sent by post or
by order to the registered letter, and addressed
to The Telegraph Publishing Company,
St. John, N. B.
Correspondence must be addressed to the
Editor of The Telegraph, St. John.
All subscriptions must be paid in advance,
and no return will be made without exception,
except for the following:

AUTHORIZED AGENTS.
The following agent is authorized to en-
courage and collect for The Semi-Weekly Tele-
graph, viz:
Wm. Somerville,
St. John, N. B.

Semi-Weekly Telegraph
ST. JOHN, N. B., JULY 30, 1904

A STORMY LEAVE-TAKING.
The newspapers and the politicians in
Ottawa and Montreal are reported to be
locked in mortal combat over the nature
of the demonstration attending the home-
coming of Lord Dunsford. There has been
on the one hand the fierce contention that
the demonstration would be wholly popu-
lar and spontaneous, and on the other
hand it has been just as fiercely main-
tained that the affair was merely political
and partisan. Discussion of the event it-
self will continue but will not settle this
dispute. As a matter of fact, everyone
knows last night's demonstration was par-
tially of both the partisan and the popular.
What purpose is to be served by attempts
to disguise the truth is not clear. Lord
Dunsford has begun his journey home in
obedience to the call of the British War
Office. A large crowd of citizens cheered
him and wished him good luck. The dis-
tinguished soldier leaves Canada with a
good will in his heart. There is no good
reason why his departure should be follow-
ed by a continuation of the pulling and
hauling which has followed his break with
the Canadian authorities.

Canadians generally will join the Ottawa
crowd in wishing for the Earl all good
luck. More than that, if the country were
today confronted with the danger of war,
and Lord Dunsford had not made his
position here an impossible one, Canadians
could think of no one whom they would
prefer to see in command of the milita-
ry in the field.

But if Lord Dunsford said at Montreal
last night, when he arrived there from
Ottawa, as he is reported in the dispatches
to have said, that "it was evident from
the demonstration that Canadians would
not see the Union Jack interfered with,"
he descended to a form of appeal which
is unworthy of an officer and a gentleman
under the circumstances. This is a sort
of bluff that Canadians will not be caught
with. The Union Jack enters in no way
into the dispute between the general officer
and the government whose subordinate he
was, and it is not "interfered with" by
men of either political party in the Do-
minion of Canada. If these words were
used they constitute a gross and inexcus-
able attempt to beg the whole question. It
will be hoped that the soldier's parting
shot was not so foolish as the reports
would indicate.

The original question raised a
few weeks ago by Lord Dunsford
was not political at all. It
was a question of authority which has
been decided again and again. The gov-
ernment of Canada, Great Britain, gives
orders and does not take them from the
general officer commanding.

THE REPUBLIC OF CANADA.

Collier's Weekly, generally a well con-
ducted and always an enterprising publi-
cation, is guilty of an indiscretion in its last
issue in permitting Mr. Frank B. Tracy
to convert Canada into a republic under
United States patronage and protection.
Canadians who read the article "The Re-
public of Canada" will see at once that
while Mr. Tracy affects a serious style
and intends to be taken seriously he cuts
a ridiculous figure even upon a casual
examination. That Collier's should have
permitted, even encouraged, this folly on
Mr. Tracy's part, is rather extraordinary.
The editor introduces this maker of re-
publics in the following language: "A
journalist by profession, and a student of
modern social and political phenomena,
Mr. Tracy has paid special attention to
the Canadian question, which long resi-
dence near the border gave him excellent
chance to study."

Long residence near the border may
have done much for Mr. Tracy. Study
of modern social and political phenomena
may have helped him. But if so one won-
ders what his condition was before these
"improvements." It must have been really
shocking. If Collier's had not given
another description of him Canadians in
this vicinity would have suspected that his
knowledge of Canadian conditions and
Canadian sentiment had been acquired
while he was a waiter or a deck-hand on
the Calvin Austin.

Mr. Tracy's weakness is that he mis-
states fact after fact and follows one in-
correct deduction with another. Here are
some samples of his statements and con-
clusions:

As a result of American immigration to
the Canadian West "the Tories are con-

fronted with the apparition of a disloyal
and seceding half of the Dominion." "The
Chamberlain preferential tariff scheme is
a two-edged sword, and, while it seems
framed to benefit the colonies, it places
Canada in a position of such close rela-
tion to England as to constitute depend-
ence, a condition which every stout Lib-
eral in the present government, especially
the Premier, has vowed again and again
he would not endure." "While Canada
has many rights and privileges of an in-
dependent nation and pays no tribute to
England, she is hampered by the knowl-
edge that she is ruled from London after
all. This is a condition which can not
long be endured by a really great people."
"The discontent consequent upon these
conditions is broad and deep, Ottawa fol-
lows the contrary notwithstanding; but
the real source of the hurt lies not so
much in today's questions as in the coun-
try's peculiar geographical position and
the international intricacies which that
position involves."

Not the least surprising of these state-
ments is the assertion that we are strug-
gling with a secession movement. The
contingency of the United States, he says,
cost Spain Cuba and Mexico. This blind
man, who lived on the Canadian border,
apparently believes that we are and will
be of the same calibre as the Cubans and
Mexicans. Canadians will not find the
picture flattering. This contingency, he
says, is a source of sedition to every col-
ony in this hemisphere. In this country
sedition is confined to the joke column. Mr.
Tracy, it must be obvious, is so ignorant
of his subject as to be harmlessly funny,
or he has intentionally palmed off upon
the editor of Collier's a literary "gold
brick." The young man really talks as
if he believed Canada would welcome some
"freedom" as is now "enjoyed" by
Panama or Cuba. Canadian freedom is
the kind that is valued in this country.

INTERNATIONAL CONTESTS.

While Canada is rejoicing over the vic-
tories of Scholes and Perry on the water
and at the butts, Englishmen and Ameri-
cans are analyzing the result of the last
track meeting between English and Ameri-
can college athletes. The third of a
series of contests between Oxford and
Cambridge on the one side and Yale and
Harvard on the other has been won by
the Americans by six points to three. This
gives the Americans two out of three wins.
The first trial was held in England and
won by the British. The next was held
on this side of the water, and the Ameri-
cans won.

It is conceded that the chances—other
things being equal—are against men in
training who leave their own country and
compete in another climate against men
native to it. So it was predicted, when
honors were even, that the country on
whose soil the competition was fought
would win except in rare instances.
The American win in London goes far to
upset that theory. There were nine
events, of which the British captured the
first and second places in the long runs,
only five were counted. Had the agree-
ment been that a win would count two
points and second place one, the result
would have been Yale-Harvard, fifteen;
Oxford-Cambridge, twelve, and the Brit-
ish representatives would have received
full credit for their decisive performances
in the endurance races.

It is generally held that in the United
States more care is taken to strengthen
the contesting team than is displayed in
England. The athletic committee at Yale
and Harvard offer inducements to star
performers developed at the preparatory
schools, as in a lesser degree do the other
large universities. Intercollegiate rivalry
is very keen among the Americans and
they have an immense native and foreign
population to draw from. In these respects
they have certain advantages to start with.
Yet they find Oxford and Cambridge hardy
antagonists. Three meetings form, of
course, a short and indecisive series. The
prize for collegiate muscle, speed and en-
durance has not yet been won and lost
decisively.

AN ALARMIST REPORT.

As if London and the Empire generally
were not already stirred gravely enough
by the known facts concerning Russian
provocation, a British news agency yester-
day sent out a story to the effect that
the annual British fleet manoeuvres had
been cancelled, that officers on leave had
been ordered to report to their ships
forthwith and that other preparations of
a highly significant character were being
undertaken. The Associated Press, which
repeated this alarmist report, subsequent-
ly withdrew it, and explained that investi-
gation had proved it unwarranted. The
British government had denied the story
and the news agency responsible for it had
issued a correction. The government
would be not unlikely to make denial of
any such report, for several reasons, and
the news agency might have been correct

in its information, but unwise in publish-
ing it. At all events the report was prem-
ature and must be regarded as unwar-
ranted.

It is clear, however, that tension in
Great Britain, which was relaxed by Rus-
sia's decision to stop privateering by her
volunteer fleet in the Red Sea, was great-
ly increased by the action of the Vladivostok
quadrant in sinking the Knight Com-
mander. The extent of the feeling in
London can be measured to some extent
by the Morning Post's statement that
this destruction of a neutral vessel is an
act of war and its sarcastic question why
Britain maintains her navy at the "two-
power standard." The Standard, we
read, "insists that the incident cannot
pass without the strongest remonstrances,
and a demand for full reparation. It says
that the situation is still exceedingly
grave, and if it continues unchanged it
may involve Russia in a serious action
for her present embarrassments." Mr.
Balfour apparently concedes that there
has been a clear breach of international
law, and the intention is to demand an
apology as well as full reparation.

American cargoes are involved and
American vessels are menaced, and some
newspapers which, only a few days ago,
were asking why the British were so un-
willing to take a dose of their own medi-
cine, are now warning the British to take
care. The Brooklyn Eagle, which saw from
the first the threat to American interests,
says "nothing less than the most famous
statesmanship in Russia would have raised
or revived the issue of the Dardanelles
at such a time as this and in such a way."
Nothing at all was gained and not a lit-
tle was lost. The recall of the cruisers is
almost equivalent to another treaty de-
claration by the Russian government that
the Dardanelles is closed absolutely to
armed ships and to ships that are intend-
ed to carry guns.

Kamimura, the Japanese admiral who
was supposed to be looking after the
Vladivostok squadron, now appears as a
tactician whose sins are as stark as
those of the Russian cruisers. By permit-
ting the Russian cruisers to elude his
squadron he has made probable com-
plications which seemed out of the ques-
tion ten days ago.

Europe generally appears unwilling
to believe that Russia desires to provoke an
other war. If that view is correct Russia
will speedily apologize, and pay up.

A NOVEL QUESTION.

The enforcement of the doctrine "Can-
ada for Canadians," is challenged in a novel
fashion by the United States government,
which now proposes to use Canadian courts
to prevent the Dominion government from
deporting American engineers. No doubt
later on the Americans will not only seek
to prevent us from deporting these gen-
tlemen but will try to compel us to employ
them at large salaries. About the only
result of this American enterprise which
can now be regarded as certain is that it
will be necessary to employ a Canadian court
through the various Canadian courts;
for we do not yet apprehend that the cus-
toms and procedure of American lawyers.

Advices from Port Arthur (Ont.), as
to the effect that the action of the gov-
ernment in moving to deport an American
engineer who is on the pay roll there at
\$300 a month is the immediate cause of
the flurry. His case is to be used as a
test of the constitutionality of the gov-
ernment's action in respect to all other
Americans who are to be replaced by
Canadians. The State department at
Washington, already somewhat busy with
the Russian seizure of neutral ships and
cargoes, is said to have found time to in-
timate its willingness to test our right
to hire our own people to the exclusion of
foreigners, and the prospect thus opened
up is one to delight a Philadelphia lawyer.

The American idea is said to be that
Canada has no legal right to deport pro-
fessional men as distinct from laborers.
If, however, Canada can deprive these
gentlemen of present employment, as it
certainly can refrain from engaging them,
and compel corporations receiving govern-
ment aid to so refrain, the danger that the
American government can deprive us of
our own money through our own courts
will not appear exactly appalling.

Canadians should take firm ground on
at least one point. They should absolutely
decline to refer this delightful question
to "an impartial tribunal of jurists of re-
pute," such as passed upon the Alaskan
boundary matter. Barring that sort of
arrangement Canada is safe enough.
Doubtless we can deport under the law,
but to refrain from doing so and avoid
the necessity for firing would appear suf-
ficient.

SURPRISING APATHY.

The commission appointed to secure the
information considered necessary in order
to frame a wise factory law is to meet
next month. Mention a volunteer com-
mittee of St. John people, whose purpose,
according to Mr. W. Frank Hatheway,
was to assist the commission and facili-
tate its conclusions, or at least its work,
has met with such surprise, and Mr.
Hatheway expresses surprise and disap-
pointment at the apathy which this volun-
teer movement has encountered.

He says that some time ago this com-
mittee, consisting of ten or fifteen rep-
resentative men and women, issued a cir-

cular to the school teachers, physicians
and clergymen of the city, asking a large
number of important questions and request-
ing that the blanks be filled in and the cir-
culars returned by the present date. As
the circular was not sent to the press and
a copy was not available yesterday, the
exact nature of the document and the ex-
tent of the ground it covered are not
known to The Telegraph. Mr. Hatheway
says, however, that school teachers, clerg-
men and physicians would have performed
a useful work had they complied with the
request of the volunteers, who, in turn,
would have passed the information along
to the commission, thus doing some of the
work which the commission was appointed
to do. It does not appear that the com-
mission was consulted, but no doubt its
members would have welcomed the light-
ening of their labors planned by the vol-
unteers had it been as successful as Mr.
Hatheway hoped.

Only a very limited number of the per-
sons to whom circulars were sent made
any response, and Mr. Hatheway says he
is particularly disappointed by the con-
duct of the physicians, only one of whom
rose to the occasion. Mr. Hatheway is
inclined to be downcast over this show
of apathy, and perhaps not without reason.
A little consideration, however, will per-
vince him that all is not yet lost. The
commission has not yet tried its hand.
As it may do the work quite successfully
in its own way despite its purely pre-
mature. Naturally the commission will enjoy
certain advantages, the lack of which neces-
sarily handicapped the volunteers some-
what heavily. The outlook is not so
cheerful because this seeming check to
Mr. Hatheway is not severe enough to
drive him altogether out of the field of
high and unselfish endeavor.

THE WAY OF THE ASSASSIN.

The Russian fleet in the Far East has
been well-nigh destroyed. The Russian
army there is fighting for its existence
against hopeless odds. Russian prestige
has been severely shaken. Russia is men-
aced by foreign powers whose merchan-
tize she has sunk. To these grave troubles
there was suddenly added Thursday morn-
ing the assassination of the Minister of
the Interior, the czar's most powerful ad-
viser. As news of this political murder
was being carried to the Emperor by
Count Muraviev, another minister, his car-
riage was stoned—a daring outrage tend-
ing to create the impression that many
were leagued by sympathy at least with
the Finn who murdered M. de Plehve.

These events taken on an even darker
significance when the way of the assass-
in in Russia is traced. It was M. de
Plehve who prosecuted the assassins of
the czar Alexander II. His predecessor,
M. Spilagine, who had attained a marked
influence over the czar, met a similar fate.
Certain elements in Russia were extremely
hostile to M. Spilagine, whom they re-
garded as a tyrant. He invited the czar
to dine with him, and flattered by his
royal master's acceptance, planned a feast
of the most costly delicacies. Before the
day of the banquet the minister was as-
saulted by a student. Then M. de
Plehve, already a man of prominence, be-
came Minister of the Interior, and began
to exercise almost autocratic power.

No one man could well be wholly re-
sponsible for all the sins with which this
man has been charged. He has been ac-
cused of personally arranging the Jewish
massacres and shielding the murderers.
Someone shielded them. The outrages in
Finland have been laid at his door. Ban-
ishment and flogging of suspected persons
was said to be his work. The story was
that M. de Witte urged the czar to
evacuate Manchuria, and that de Plehve
brought about the disgrace of the czar's
Minister of Finance and, with Alexan-
der and others of like ambition, persuaded
the Emperor to hold the disputed territory
and continue the policy of bluff and
intimidation which caused Japan to attack
the Russians were wretchedly ill-
prepared for the struggle.

M. de Plehve, as has been said, could
scarcely have been as black as he was
painted, yet he appears to have been
hated more than any other man in all
the Russian. He had accepted responsi-
bility for the policy in Finland which led
to the assassination of Bobrikoff, its gov-
ernor, a few weeks ago. A Finn killed
the governor, and the slayer of the minis-
ter is said to be a Finn also. A year ago
Mr. W. T. Stead addressed an open letter
to M. de Plehve, protesting in the name
of civilization against Russia's course in
Finland. Contrary to the usual practice
of statements the minister sent a reply
to the Review of Reviews, in the course
of which he said: "Having elucidated the
substantially unalterable aims of Russian
policy, we have proceeded to the ques-
tions which have led to its present in-
cidental and temporary form of expression.
This, undoubtedly, is distinguished by its
severity, but such are the requirements of
a utilitarian policy." Mr. Stead insisted
that Russia's worst enemy could not have
framed a defence more disastrous to her
country's reputation. "For," said he,
"what in substance does M. de Plehve's
reply amount to? Briefly this, that the
imperial government holds as a self-evident
proposition that in its dealings with its
Finnish subjects it cannot, in the very
nature of things, bind itself by any en-
gagement. No matter how precisely the
terms of that engagement may be drawn,
or how solemnly they may be attested
even by the oath of the emperor himself,
it cannot divest itself of its inherent right

to disregard its promises, to ignore its en-
gagements, and to break its oaths." "I am
afraid the great gulf between the Russian
government and the rest of the world is
as vast as the gulf which divides the living
from the dead."

BLAMING NEW BRUNSWICK.

The Pulp and Paper Magazine of Can-
ada, in discussing the relation of British
investors to the Canadian pulp industry,
is inclined to hold New Brunswick in a
measure responsible for the fact that it
is now difficult to interest English and
Scottish capitalists in Dominion pulp pro-
perties. The difficulty is ascribed partly
to the tightness of money and the low
price of consols. British bankers and
financial agents, the pulp journal says, are
not very partial to Canada as a field for
investment. Though they purchase our
first class municipal bonds, and the debentures of
the best loan corporations, they are by no
means enthusiastic over the mining and
industrial chances which are constantly
being offered to them. It is mainly Cana-
dian and American money that is invest-
ed in our forest products. The pulp mag-
azine says in this connection:

"The British investors' shyness of the
Canadian pulp industry has been greatly
increased by the experience of the Scotch
and English capitalists who ventured
money in New Brunswick projects. Their
confidence in pulp making enterprises
has been freshly shaken by the reports of
the British company which owns the
Misipee mill. They appear to have an idea
that investments in such industries here
are bound to turn out disappointing. On-
tario fares little better in the opinion of
British investors. The manager of one of
the great English paper factories is ready
to tell anyone that Ontario does not con-
tain a thousand tons of pulp or an honest
man."

Yet Pulp and Paper does not regard the
outlook as by any means as hopeless as
its quoted statement would imply. The
remedy it suggests affords reason to be-
lieve that there is money in pulp—and in
paper—if the Canadian industry gets a
fair trial. It is pointed out that some of
the great London dailies use forty tons
of paper every day, and that some of
them must soon build their own mills.

Canadians, the magazine suggests, should
let the British capitalists and paper
makers go their way and interest the
British consumers. There is already dif-
ficulty in securing enough pulp wood from
Norway and Sweden where no attempt is
made to conserve the forests, and within
a few years the larger British consumers
will apparently find it necessary to man-
ufacture for themselves as a measure of
self-protection. "Some are making pre-
parations now. For three years the
Harmsworths have been looking for a site.
Their men have been through Canada,
Newfoundland and Scandinavia, but no ar-
rangements have yet been made; and we
learn on good authority that their mill is
still just as likely to be placed in Ontario
as anywhere else."

It will be remembered that one of the
Harmsworths inspected pulp areas and
water powers in New Brunswick more
than a year ago. He found both satis-
factory, and an arrangement might have been
completed had not the prospective in-
vestors asked too many valuable privileges
for nothing. As Ontario is no more liberal
in concessions as Mr. Harmsworth seemed to
think we should be in this country, there is
some likelihood that he may make new
overtures here before long. As the needs
of the paper consumers grow the pulp
prospects of Canada should brighten.

THE LAW OF THE SEA.

Mr. Balfour's long statement Thursday
in the House of Commons, while calm and
judicial in tone, is strong enough to war-
rant the belief that the government has
acted with firmness and has much hope
that the issue will be both peaceful and
satisfactory. The government believes
that the sinking of the Knight Commander
constitutes a clear offence under the in-
ternational code. Had she been merely
seized and held for a prize court the case
would have been one simply for protest
and close inquiry. But to sink the vessel
was to destroy the best evidence in exist-
ence and to assume that a naval captain
may arrogate to himself with safety
powers exceeding those of the prize court.
Mr. Balfour, in his statement of the
case, adheres closely to the opinion ex-
pressed by Hall in his International Law,
who says of the capture of a neutral ship:

"He must bring in the captured prop-
erty for adjudication, and must use all
reasonable speed in doing so. In case of
improper delay denurrance is given to
the claimant, and costs and expenses are
referred to the court. It follows as of
course from this rule—which itself is a
necessary consequence of the fact that
property in neutral ships or goods is not
transferred by capture—that a neutral ves-
sel must not be destroyed. . . . To
destroy a ship is a punishable wrong; if

Buy Suits Now!

We told you last week that in order to clear out lines in
which the sizes were broken, we would sell \$10 Suits for
\$6.98. Since then we have sold more suits than in any
previous one week, and in order to keep up the interest have
added other lines to the Bargain Counters.

SEE OUR BARGAIN SUITS AT
\$3.98, \$5.00, 6.98 and \$10.

STORE CLOSURE SATURDAY AT 1 O'CLOCK, sharp.

J. N. HARVEY, Men's and Boys' Clothier,
199 and 201 Union Street.

WAUKEGAN

Barbed Wire Fencing

Costs about 10 per cent more but runs 20 per cent further
than any other brand and is therefore cheapest for farmers to
use. Strong as the strongest.

If your dealers cannot supply you write to

W. H. THORNE & CO., Ltd.,
Market Square, St. John, N. B.

it cannot be brought in for adjudication
it can and ought to be released."

The Russian commander, then, was
bound to bring the neutral vessel before
a prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is to destroy the
prize court, or release her. The exist-
ence of a state of war does not of itself
operate to suspend the respect for the safe-
guards of a neutral commerce. If the
prize court finds that ship and cargo were
violating the war law of the sea the owners
have no redress. But to destroy a sus-
pected merchantman is