

ENGLAND MUST SUBMIT

Text of the President's Venezuela Message.

The Little Republic Will Be Protected by Force, if Necessary—No Calamity So Great as Supine Submission to Wrong—The Monroe Doctrine Applies—He Recommends the Selection of a Commission to Ascertain the Boundary—Lord Salisbury's Note.

Washington, Dec. 18.—The following is the full text of the message sent to congress yesterday by President Cleveland in connection with the Venezuela correspondence:

"To the congress—In my annual message to the congress on the 3d inst. I called attention to the pending boundary dispute between Great Britain and the republic of Venezuela, and recited the substance of a representation made by this government to her Britannic majesty's government, suggesting reasons why such dispute should be submitted to arbitration for settlement and inquiring whether it would be so submitted. The answer of the British government, which was then awaited, has since been received, and, together with the dispatch to which it is a reply, is hereto appended. Such reply is embodied in two communications addressed by the British prime minister to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at this capital. It will be seen that one of these communications is devoted exclusively to observations upon the Monroe doctrine and claims that in the present instance a new and strange extension and development of the doctrine is insisted upon by the United States; that the reasons justifying an appeal to the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe are generally inapplicable to the state of things in which we live at the present day, and especially inapplicable to a controversy involving the boundary line between Great Britain and Venezuela.

Monroe Doctrine Sound.

"Without attempting extended argument in reply to these positions, it may not be amiss to suggest that the doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of government. It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and cannot become obsolete while our republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the governments of the old world, and a subject for an absolute non-interference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their government. Assuming, therefore, that we may properly insist upon this doctrine without regard to the state of things in which we live, or any changed conditions here or elsewhere, it is not apparent why its application may not be invoked in the present controversy. If a European power, by an extension of its boundaries, takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why to that extent, such European power does not thereby attempt to extended its system of government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken. This is the precise action which President Monroe declared to be 'dangerous to our peace and safety,' and it can make no difference whether the European system is extended by an advance of frontier or otherwise.

Exclusive American Principles.

"It is also suggested in the British reply that we should not seek to apply the Monroe doctrine to the pending dispute, because it does not embody any principle of international law which is founded on the general consent of nations, and that 'no statesman, however eminent, and no nation, however powerful, are competent to insert into the code of international law a novel principle which was never recognized before, and which has not since been accepted by the government of any other country.' Practically, the principle for which we contend has peculiar, if not exclusive, relation to the United States. It may not have been admitted in so many words to the code of international law, but since in international law every nation is entitled to rights belonging to it, if the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine is something we may justly claim, it has its place in the code of international law as certainly and as securely as if it were specifically mentioned, and when the United States is a suitor before the high tribunal that administers international law the question to be determined is whether or not we present claims which the justice of that code can find to be right and valid. The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in these principles of international law which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights

protected and its just claims enforced.

Clear Rights and Undoubted Claims

"Of course this government is entirely confident that, under the sanction of this doctrine, we have clear rights and undoubted claims. Nor is this ignored in the British reply. The prime minister, while not admitting that the Monroe doctrine is applicable to present conditions, states: 'In declaring that the United States would resist any such enterprise if it was contemplated, President Monroe adopted a policy which received the entire sympathy of the English government of that date.' He further declares: 'Though the language of President Monroe is directed to the attainment of objects which most Englishmen would agree to be salutary, it is impossible to admit that they have been inscribed by any adequate authority in the code of international law.' Again he says: 'They (her majesty's government) fully concur with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of any European state, would be a highly inexpedient change.' Anxious to learn in a satisfactory manner whether Great Britain sought under a claim of boundary, to extend her possessions on this continent without right, or whether she merely sought possession of territory fairly included within her lines of ownership, this government proposed to the government of Great Britain a resort to arbitration as the proper means of settling the question, to the end that a vexatious boundary dispute between the two contestants might be determined and our exact standing and relation in respect to the controversy might be made clear.

Our Course is Clear.

"It will be seen from the correspondence herewith submitted that this proposition has been declined by the British government upon grounds which, in the circumstances, seem to be far from satisfactory. It is deeply disappointing that such an appeal, actuated by the most friendly feelings towards both nations directly concerned, addressed to the sense of justice and to the magnanimity of one of the great powers of the world and touching its relations to one comparatively small and weak, should have produced no better results. The course to be pursued by this country, in view of the present condition, does not appear to admit of serious doubt. Having labored faithfully for many years to induce Great Britain to submit this dispute to impartial arbitration, and having been so finally apprised of her refusal to do so, nothing remains but to accept the situation, to recognize its plain requirements, and to act accordingly. Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States.

The United States Must Act.

"Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should, of course, be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records and facts in support of the claim of both parties.

Must Resist By Every Means.

"In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner, I suggest that the congress make an adequate appropriation for the expenses of a commission to be appointed by the executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a wilful aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of any governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belong to Venezuela. In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the full responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow.

No Calamity Like Supine Submission

"I am, nevertheless, firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English-speaking people of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization, and as generous and worthy rivals in all the paths of peace, there is no calamity of a great nation can invite which is so great as that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice and the consequent loss of national self-reliance and honor, beneath which is the safety and greatness.

"GROVER CLEVELAND."

SALISBURY'S REPLY.

The Monroe Doctrine Not Applicable to the Venezuela Dispute.

Washington, Dec. 18.—The British side of the Venezuela dispute is embodied in two notes from Lord Salisbury to Sir Julian Pauncefote. Both notes are dated the same day, and one, which the ambassador is directed to communicate to Secretary Olney, is of the highest importance, as in it Lord Salisbury goes broadly into the Monroe doctrine. The main points are as follows:

Differs with Olney.

"On the 7th of August I transmitted to Lord Gough a copy of the dispatch from Mr. Olney, which Mr. Bayard had left with me that day, and of which he had read portions to me. I informed him at the time that it could not be answered until it had been carefully considered by the law officers of the crown. I have therefore deferred replying to it until after the recess. I will not now deal with those portions of it which deal exclusively with the controversy that has for some time past existed between the republic of Venezuela and her majesty's government in regard to the boundary which separates their dominions. I take a very different view from Mr. Olney of various matters upon which he touches in that part of the dispatch. The contentions set forth by Mr. Olney are represented by him as being an application of the political maxims which are well known in American discussion under the name of the Monroe doctrine.

No Danger of European Imposition.

"As far as I am aware, this doctrine has never before been advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the government of another nation, but it has been generally adopted and assumed as true by many eminent writers and politicians in the United States. It is said to have largely influenced the government of that country in the conduct of its foreign affairs; though Mr. Clayton, who was secretary of state under President Taylor, expressly stated that that administration had in no way adopted it. The dangers which were apprehended by President Monroe have no relation to the state of things in which we live at the present day. There is no danger of any alliance imposing its system upon any portion of the American continent, and there is no danger of any European state treating any part of the American continent as a fit object of European colonization.

Purely a Personal Dispute.

"The British empire and the republic of Venezuela are neighbors, and they differ as to the line by which their dominions are separated. It is a controversy with which the United States have no apparent practical concern. It is difficult, indeed, to see how it can materially affect any state or community outside those primarily interested, except, perhaps, other parts of her majesty's dominions, such as Trinidad. It is simply the determination of the frontier of a British possession which belonged to the throne of England long before the republic of Venezuela came into existence."

What England Would Do.

The second note of November 25 is wholly devoted to a discussion of the boundary dispute, exclusive of its relation to the Monroe doctrine. This dispatch, however, sounds the keynote of Great Britain's position with reference to Mr. Olney's representations. Lord Salisbury states that Great Britain has repeatedly expressed its willingness to submit to arbitration the conflicting claims of Great Britain to territory of great mineral value, and follows this statement with these important words: "But they (the British government) cannot consent to entertain or to submit to the arbitration of another power or a foreign jurist, however eminent, claims based on extravagant pretensions of Spanish officials in the last century, and involving the transfer of large numbers of British subjects who have for many years enjoyed the settled rule of the British colony, to a nation of different race and language, whose political system is subject to frequent disturbance, and whose institutions as yet too often afford very inadequate protection to life and property. No issue of this description has ever been involved in the questions which Great Britain and the United States have consented to submit to arbitration, and her majesty's government is convinced that in similar circumstances the government of the United States would be equally firm in declining to entertain proposals of such a nature." Lord Salisbury concludes with the statement that her majesty's government have not surrendered the hope that the controversy between themselves and Venezuela will be adjusted by reasonable arrangement at an early date.

Throw the Priest Out Bodily.

Lansing, Mich., Dec. 18.—A number of the parishoners of St. Mary's Roman Catholic church who are opposed to Father Slattery went yesterday to the priest's house, dragged him from bed, and threw him bodily into the street. It is probable that they will all be expelled.

UPHOLD THE PRESIDENT

His Action Forceful and Has General Approval.

The Venezuela Affair the All-absorbing Topic of Conversation in Washington—Views of Senators and Representatives—The Message Cheered.

Washington, Dec. 18.—President Cleveland's Venezuela message is the all-absorbing topic of conversation in both official and private circles to-day and the consensus of opinion is in effect that the president's attitude was forceful and in thorough accord with the sentiments of the people generally. When the message was read in the senate evidences of approval were equally strong and significant on both sides of the chamber—perhaps even more so on the republican than on the democratic side. Mr. Morgan, dem., Ala., looking over to the republican side remarked that there was "no mistaking the meaning of that," and Mr. Frye, rep., Me., gave an assenting nod, with the remark "that is capital." The message and accompanying papers were ordered printed and referred to the committee on foreign relations. The committee was authorized to sit during any recess of the senate. In the house the reading of the message evoked hearty applause on both sides. It was referred to the committee on foreign affairs.

Views of Representatives.

Mr. Russell, rep., Conn.: The message is good. Anything less would be unpatriotic and cowardly in a president of the United States. A commission will delay the settlement of the controversy and furnish information already known. Its suggestion is prudent, perhaps, and allows England a chance to retract. Mr. McCreary, dem., Ky., who was chairman of the foreign affairs committee in the last congress: It is vigorous, powerful and able. As a reaffirmation of the Monroe doctrine it will attract wide attention and, I believe, be generally approved by the people. Mr. Cummings, dem., N. Y.: The message breathes the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe and Andrew Jackson. President Cleveland's action stands in strong contrast with the cowardly action of Lord Salisbury in Armenian affairs. The president stands by the Monroe doctrine, and he undoubtedly means every word he says. Mr. Bartlett, dem., N. Y.: I am glad to see that the president has decided in favor of resisting the aggressions of Great Britain in respect to the boundary dispute. I believe it is practically conceded that England's title to a large part of the disputed territory is a title which might alone give. We should force Great Britain to recede from her position and relinquish the territory.

South American Diplomats Pleased.

The diplomatic representatives of American republics in Washington were highly elated over the message and nearly all of them cabled copious extracts of the document to their respective governments. Ever since the Corinto affair they had been somewhat despondent over the supposed indisposition of the United States to resist foreign aggressions on the American continent, but now they cannot find language adequate to express their admiration for the president's forcible utterances, particularly in regard to the possible resort to other competitions than those "in the arts of peace." None of the American ministers or charge d'affaires, however, consented to speak authoritatively for their governments in the absence of instructions nor would any be led into a public interview on the subject.

Expressions of Senators.

Mr. Gorman, dem., Md.: It is a very thorough, emphatic and strong American message. It looks very much as if the president intended to enforce the Monroe doctrine. Mr. Call, dem., Fla.: It is excellent, splendid. The matter is still open to arbitration and I am sure England will finally consent. Mr. Lodge, rep., Mass.: The message is the most serious and important utterance which has been submitted by any president to congress for many years. As a matter of course I heartily approve of its spirit and the general position taken.

REBELS TWICE DEFEATED.

Government Success in Cuba Reported at Madrid.

Madrid, Dec. 18.—A dispatch to the Imparcial from Santiago de Cuba says that a government force under the command of Col. Garrido has twice defeated the rebels under Jose Maceo at Peladeros. The dispatch further says that Col. Zamora has routed 800 insurgents at Jamal. The Spanish losses in each of the engagements was slight.

Rebel Defeat Reported.

Madrid, Dec. 18.—A dispatch to the Imparcial from Havana says that Colonel Arizon has defeated Gomez and Maceo with heavy loss at Mal Tiempo. The rebels retreated hastily, burning the railway bridge at Flore behind them and cutting off communication.

AS VIEWED IN ENGLAND

British Press Comment on the Message.

The Views Advanced by President Cleveland Are Vigorously Contended—The Monroe Doctrine a Matter Only of History Now, the Newspapers Claim.

London, Dec. 18.—The Daily News, commenting on President Cleveland's message to congress on the Venezuelan question, will to-day say: "The president's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the president seem to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritative in negotiations with a foreign power. Both of them are certainly as far as possible from suspecting that the real author of the doctrine was Canning, not Monroe. Great Britain in 1823 was jealous of the Spanish encroachments in South America and induced Monroe to protest against European aggression on American soil. The seventy-two years that have since elapsed have entirely changed that situation. The Monroe doctrine is now purely of historical interest. The definition of the doctrine, however, is a matter for the Americans themselves. It binds nobody else. The president in his account of the doctrine surrenders the whole case. It follows from the message that Guiana, and, indeed, Canada, have no right of independent existence on American soil. The concluding portions of Mr. Cleveland's message are not expressed in the language usually employed by one friendly power to another. They are aggressive, even menacing. England is threatened with war unless she permits Mr. Cleveland to adjust the boundaries of Venezuela. Happily, there is some sense of humor in the American people. Regarded as a party move, the message is not unskillful. It puts the republicans in a hole."

With Blank Astonishment.

The Chronicle will say: "The message will be read in this country with blank astonishment. An American commission to determine what territory a British colony can call its own, and failing our compliance with its finding, war by land and sea with Great Britain. Can these be serious words addressed to us by the descendants of the little shipload of English folks who sailed in the Mayflower? We will not take things too seriously. We will suppose that the president is engaged in the familiar work of twisting the lion's tail. There is one answer to President Cleveland and America. If an enlarged application of a neglected doctrine is to be enforced with all the might of the United States at least let us be assured of the correlative that the United States will make itself responsible for the foreign policy of all the petty, impetuous little states on the two continents of America. There is no international right without corresponding duty. We can only express genuine regret at the tone of the document, which meets no argument made by Lord Salisbury, and which applies a threat of force from a daughter state to the motherland over an obscure, trumpety dispute in which the United States has no real interest, but the message cannot obscure of defeat the affection which subsists between the two countries, or break the ties of blood that must needs bind them in indissoluble union."

Outdone the Republicans.

The Morning Post says: "President Cleveland has outdone the republican party in his effort to show his dislike for this country, yet he has not committed himself to anything. The international law tribunal that President Cleveland asks congress to set up can have no more binding effect on this country than would a decision by the supreme court at Washington."

Cleveland's Position Preposterous.

The Standard says: Most Englishmen will read the message with unfeigned astonishment. The position taken by Mr. Cleveland is preposterous. There can be only one answer to such a demand. We decline to humiliate ourselves and refuse to accept the decision of the United States executive in matters altogether outside of his jurisdiction. As British subjects have settled up to the Schomberg line, we cannot possibly withdraw our protection and leave them to the risks of the revolutions and misrule of the republic; but beyond the pale of settlement we are quite willing to accept arbitration. By the same rule the United States might be asked to submit their title to Alaska to the judgment of impartial umpires. Congress would indignantly reject such a demand. So will the British government reject the present demand."

ALLEN G. THURMAN'S WILL.

An Estate of About \$100,000 Left. Three Children Survive Him.

Columbus, O., Dec. 18.—The will of Allen G. Thurman will be read in probate court Thursday. The estate is worth about \$100,000. There are three children—Elizabeth T. McCormack, Mary T. Halliday and Allen W. Thurman.

MANY CARS WRECKED

Riots Attend Philadelphia's Traction Strike.

Not a Wheel of the Company Involved Turning This Morning and Only One Line in the City in Operation—Mobs, Composed Mostly of Boys, Wreck About 300 Cars.

Philadelphia, Dec. 18.—Riot and destruction marked the opening day of the great strike of the street car employees of the Union Traction company. Aided by the mischievous, lawless element, the strikers succeeded in completely tying up the lines of the Union Traction company this morning, with the exception of the one line not controlled by the company involved in the strike, not a street car wheel was turning in Philadelphia. Never before in the history of the city has there been witnessed such widespread disorder. To the credit of the strikers it may be said that the disorders were created by too ardent sympathizers. Boys held up cars and drove the motormen and conductors from their posts with volleys of bricks and stones and then smashed the glass in the windows of the cars, cut the trolley ropes, pulled out the fuses, smashed in the cash registers and tore off the fenders in front of the cars. In all about 300 cars were badly wrecked, and last evening the traction company gave up the effort to run cars, and, with the aid of the police, withdrew their shattered and abandoned rolling stock back into the car sheds.

More Trouble Anticipated.

The mayor issued a proclamation calling upon all good citizens to preserve the peace and asking them to refrain from gathering in crowds on the streets. He further added that violence and riot would be met with force and that the peace of the city will be preserved at all hazards. While the crowds attacked the cars, the spirit of the mob seemed to be one of malicious mischief more than threatening temper that marks a real riot. The suddenness of the numerous outbreaks seemed to take the police by surprise, and for a time cars were wrecked with impunity in the very heart of the retail shopping district. Then the patrolmen were massed at every threatened point and this morning every policeman in the city is on duty. The company made no attempt to run cars last night, but under police protection they will start the Market street branch of their line some time to-day, and trouble is sure to follow, and to-day may witness more serious rioting than took place yesterday.

Strikers Made No Disturbance.

The strikers attempted no interference with the cars, but confined their efforts to trying to dissuade the motormen and conductors who were not with them from going out on the cars. They met them as they went to work and talked with them, and in many cases were successful. Where a man would refuse to join them he might get sharply spoken to, but beyond this he was not threatened. In anticipation of any trouble six squads of policemen were massed at the various car stables as the most likely places where it would occur. The police allowed no congregations of men around the car stables, but they met with the greatest annoyance from women and boys who stood by and jeered and hooted at the motormen and conductors as they went out. There was no concerted movement to attack the cars, but in a dozen different places at once obstructions were put on the track. When the cars came to a stop some one would throw a stone. Then missiles of every description would strike the car until not a window was left. In no case were the motormen or conductors very roughly handled, the crowds being content to wreck the cars.

Boys the Wreckers.

Some of the worst destruction occurred on Chestnut street. A little bootblack alongside a stalled car swung his box and dashed it through one of the windows. Every boy in the crowd immediately proceeded to take a hand in the destruction and in less time than it takes to think of it every light in the car was broken. The stalling of this car banked up behind it as far as Thirteenth street thirteen other cars. The mob swept up the street with stones and clubs and drove the conductors and motormen away and wrecked the cars. Because a motorman, who was being hooted at by a store messenger boy, made a kick at the youngster a gang of his companions dragged the motorman and conductor from their platforms and wrecked the car in a twinkling. Just above Ninth street a policeman was standing beside one of the wrecked cars hemmed in by the crowd. A boy about 17 years of age jumped on the car and taking a heavy iron switch rod proceeded to deliberately wreck the interior. After he had finished his work he disappeared. The police were powerless to stop him.