THE RECORD-UNION.

VOLUME XC.—NO. 102. SACRAMENTO, WEDNESDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 18, 1895.—SIX PAGES. WHOLE NO. 16,902.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A NOTE OF WAR.

Great Britain Must Yield or Fight.

MONROE DOCTRINE TESTED.

President Cleveland Reasserts It With Unmistakable Vigor.

SECRETARY OLNEY DEFENDS IT.

If Venezuela is Right in Her Contentions, We Are With Her.

THE UNITED STATES WILL TOLERATE NO AGGRESSION.

The Boundary Line Must be Definitely Fixed, and Then if the British Extend Their Jurisdiction Beyond It They Will Have to Resort to Arms to Accomplish Their Ends—Monarchies Will Not be Allowed to Gain Greater Foothold Upon Any American Soil—A Ringing Message All Through.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—President Cleveland to-day transmitted to Congress the following message on the Venezuela incident:

"To the Congress of the United States: In my annual message addressed to Congress on the 3d inst. I called attention to the pending boundary controversy between Great Britain and the republic of Venezuela, and recited the substance of the representations made by this Government to her Britannic Majesty's Government, suggesting the reasons why such disputes 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 Embassador 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 this doctrine is insisted on by the United States, and that the reasons justifying an appeal to the doctrine, as enunciated by President Monroe, are generally inapplicable to the state of things in which we live at the present day, and especially in their application to the controversy concerning the boundary line between Great Britain and Venezuela.

"Without attempting extended arguments 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 our absolute non-interference, none the less is the observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their Government.

"Assuming, therefore, that we may properly insist upon the 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 any 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 extend 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.

"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 contest of nations,' and 'that no statesman, however eminent, and no nation, however powerful, is 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 Governments 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 councils every nation is entitled to the 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 the claims which the justice of that code of law can find to be right and valid.

"The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in those principles of international law which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights protected and its just claims enforced.

"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 not applicable to the 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: 'Through the language of President Monroe is directed to the attainment of the objects which most Englishmen would agree to be salutory, 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 existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisition on the part of any European State, would be a highly inexpedient change.'

"In the belief that the doctrine for which we contend was clear and definite; that it was founded upon substantial considerations and involved our safety and welfare; that it was fully applicable to our present conditions, and to the pending controversy and without any conviction as to the final merits of the dispute, but anxious to learn in a satisfactory and conclusive manner whether Great Britain sought under the claim of boundary to extend her possessions on this continent without right, or whether she merely sought the possession of territory facially included within her lines of ownership, this Government proposed to the Government of Great Britain to resort to arbitration as a 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.

"It will be seen from the correspondence herewith submitted that this proposition has been declined by the British Government, upon grounds which under the circumstances seem to me to be far from satisfactory. It is deeply disappointing that such an appeal, actuated by the most friendly feelings toward both the 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 weak and small, should have produced no better results.

"The course to be pursued by this Government, 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 now finally apprised of her refusal to do so, nothing remains but to accept the situation, to recognize its plain requirements and deal with it accordingly.

"Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of 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. 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. 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 claims of both parties.

"In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner, I suggest that Congress make 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 willful aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of Governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we heve determined of right belongs to Venezuela.

"In making these recommendations, I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred and fully realize all the consequences that may follow.

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

"GROVER CLEVELAND.

"Executive Mansion, Dec. 17, 1895."

THE CORRESPONDENCE.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—Accompanying the President's message to Congress was a voluminous correspondence on the Venezuelan question between Mr. Olney and Lord Salisbury through Minister Bayard. The correspondence begins with Secretary Olney's note of July 20th last, reopening negotiations with Great Britain in regard to the boundary dispute and containing the present Administration's enunciation of the Monroe doctrine. Mr. Olney says in the beginning that the claims of both Great Britain and Venezuela as to the boundary between the latter country and British Guiana are of a somewhat indefinite character, but that while Venezuela has for a long time sought to have the dispute settled by arbitration, Great Britain has insisted upon the condition that the arbitration should relate only to such of the disputed territory as lies west of a line designated by herself. After reviewing the phases of the controversy which resulted in the suspension of diplomatic relations between Venezuela and Great Britain in 1887, and describing the efforts made by the South American republic since that time to obtain arbitration without success, Secretary Olney states that the matter had reached a stage when the United States in view of its traditional policy could not be indifferent.

Mr. Olney summarizes the important features of the existing situation as follows:

First—The title to territory of indefinite but confessedly very large extent is in dispute between Great Britain on the one hand and the South American republic of Venezuela on the other.

Second—The disparity in the strength of the claimants is such that Venezuela can hope to establish her claim only through peaceful methods—through an agreement with her adversary either upon the subject itself or upon an arbitration.

Third—The controversy, with varying claims on the part of Great Britain, has existed for more than half a century, during which period many earnest and persistent efforts of Venezuela to establish a boundary by agreement have proved unsuccessful.

Fourth—The futility of the endeavor to obtain a conventional line being recognized, Venezuela for a quarter of a century has asked and striven for arbitration.

Fifth—Great Britain, has always and continuously refused to arbitrate, except upon the condition of a renunciation of a large part of the territory in controversy.

Sixth—By the frequent interposition of its good offices at the instance of Venezuela, by constantly urging and

[CONTINUED ON SIXTH PAGE.]

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Commented Upon by Americans Only in the Most Favorable Terms.

PARTISANSHIP LAID ASIDE IN DISCUSSING THE MATTER.

"The Most Serious and Important Message Which Has Been Submitted to Congress by Any President for Many Years," Are the Words of Senator Lodge (Rep.) of Massachusetts.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—Commenting on the President's message to-day, Senator Lodge (Rep.) of Massachusetts said: "This message is the most serious and important message which has been submitted by any President to Congress for many years. As a matter of course I heartily approve of its spirit, its conclusions and the general position taken, for I took the same ground myself last June in an article in the North American Review, before public attention had been drawn to the matter at all, and again in an interview which I gave to the correspondent of a New York paper last October in Paris.

"The President argues briefly the standing of the Monroe doctrine as a matter of international law. I do not myself think that it is a question of international law at all. It is really a mere question of fact, like the independence of the United States. The President seems also to have gone to the very verge of safety in stating that we should assent to any amicable agreement between Venezuela and Great Britain as to boundaries. We undoubtedly should do so in this instance, but we should equally of course not assent to indefinite cessions of territory by any South American State to a European Power. For example, any attempt of Great Britain to take possession of Cuba under a cession from Spain, which the morning papers state is in contemplation, would be regarded by the United States as an act of war. The President, however, has, I think, guarded his statement on this point from being drawn into a precedent by the use of the word 'boundaries.'

"But these are small points, comparatively speaking. The main contention of the message is thoroughly sound and will meet with universal support. That is the contention that Great Britain, on the pretext of a boundary dispute has seized American territory, which she did not hold prior to 1823; that she has declined to submit the question to arbitration, and thus proposes to hold the disputed territory by force. This being the case, as the President states, there is nothing for the United States to do under these circumstances but to determine the true divisional line between Venezuela and Guiana, and then resist by all means in her power any attempt of the British to take territory beyond that line. This is a sound American position.

"I do not myself believe that the English people have the least desire to engage in hostilities with the United States. They care but little, and know less, about the Venezuelan dispute; they do not realize that, while it is a mere question of more or less territory to England, it involves for the United States a principle as vital almost to their rights and interests as a nation as their own independence. Ambitious politicians in England, eager for personal political reasons to distinguish themselves by a vigorous foreign public-spirited colonial policy, have undertaken to push and browbeat the United States until they have brought the two countries nearly to the verge of war.

"It is to be hoped that the President's message will make the English people understand that this is to us a vital question; that we are wholly content to leave it to arbitration, but that if arbitration is declined, we shall resist this aggression to the utmost, and that, although we do not seek war, we do not fear it."

Mr. Brice (Dem.) of Ohio: "The idea of appointing a commission suggests a long continuance of the discussion. Commissions drawing a per diem do not conclude their labors speedily, and no one can tell when this commission would cease to draw its per diem."

Mr. Gorman (Dem.) of Maryland: "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. Pugh (Dem.) of Alabama: "On this matter Democrats and Republicans come together with one accord. I am for war and free coinage. The message certainly indicates that there will be war, unless England backs down."

Mr. Call (Dem.) of Florida: "It is excellent, splendid. The matter is still open to arbitration, and I am sure England will finally consent."

Mr. Vilas (Dem.) of Wisconsin: "I look upon it as a strong and able paper, one that will rank with any State paper issued by any Administration."

Voorhees (Dem.) of Indiana—I indorse every word of the message. It strikes the right key, and will meet with a sympathetic response in the heart of every American.

The following comments on the message shows the feeling of House members:

Livingston of Georgia, who has been conspicuous in his championship of Venezuela, found much to commend in the message. He said: "Cleveland's message is clear-cut American. He distinctly recognizes the Monroe doctrine in all its length and breadth, and as specially applicable in the dispute now pending between Great Britain and Venezuela. He declares emphatically for resistance against British oppression, and like the man he is, against further delay and further appeals for arbitration. His message will find a warm response in the hearts of all Americans."

Representative Sherman (Rep.) of New York said: "The message has to it an American ring that is as gratifying as it has been unusual during this Administration. I am glad to commend it without qualification."

Representative Quigg (Rep.) of New York—President Cleveland's message is admirable in every respect. I shall vote for the commission he proposes. The President has met his duty in a manner which is at once dignified, equitable and complete, and the sentiment of the all parties and of the whole country will indorse his position heartily."

Grosvenor (Rep.) of Ohio: "The message is a strong, clean-cut demand for the observance and defense of the Monroe doctrine, and in the light of the dispatches from the British Government, it is only a little short of a declaration of war, unless England recedes or seeks further diplomacy. The position taken by the President is, at first glance, a step in advance of our official declarations of our country. If the attitude of England, as announced, is the ultimatum, then the message is a menace of war. It may be said in friendly criticism of the message that it has possibly gone just a shade too far in this direction, and apparently the President does not feel much need of Congressional action. To ascertain by a commission to be sent to a foreign country to ascertain, decide and report upon a dispute between two other countries is novel and will possibly lead to results which Congress will not be willing to contribute to."

McCall (Rep.) of Massachusetts: "The message of the President is a spirited and noble document, and should receive the united support of both parties."

Russell (Rep.) of Connecticut: "The message is good. Anything less would be unpatriotic and cowardly in a President of the United States. Its suggestion is prudent, perhaps, and allows England a chance to retract. It is not necessary, and we do not want to dally any over this controversy."

McCreary (Dem.) of Kentucky, who was Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the last Congress: "It is vigorous, positive and able. I admire the firm and positive course taken by the President, and I believe the House of Representatives will support him in his efforts to uphold the Monroe doctrine, and prevent Great Britain from making illegal encroachments on the territory of Venezuela."

LONDON PRESS COMMENT.

LONDON, Dec. 17.—The Daily News, commenting on the President's message on the Venezuelan question, will say: "The President's communication is a remarkable document, though its consequences are not likely to be serious. Neither Mr. Olney nor the President seems 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 18— 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 the situation. The Monroe doctrine is now purely of historical interest. There can be no doubt that the theory enunciated in 1823 dealt with the acquisition of fresh territory, and had nothing to do with disputes regarding the boundaries of territories already appropriated. The definition of the doctrine, however, is a matter for Americans themselves. It binds nobody else. The Venezuelan difficulty must be considered on its own merits. This is what Lord Salisbury has done in a masterly dispatch. As he has refused general unrestricted arbitration, upon which, by the way, the Monroe doctrine is silent, it must be assumed that he would not assent to the mode of ascertaining the rights of the parties that Mr. Cleveland suggests.

"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 arbitrate the boundary of Venezuela. Happily, there is some sense of humor in the American people. The message puts the Republicans in a hole. If they agree to the appointment of a commission they will give Mr. Cleveland such credit as belongs to it, and will enable him or the Democratic candidate to pose as an accomplished twister of the Lion's tail. If, on the other hand, they refuse to agree to the commission, they will give the Democrats a chance of accusing them of being servile friends of the British, but the great body of the American public will not be led by any such motive or considerations."

The Chronicle will say: "The message will be read in this country with blank astonishment. The American commission to determine what territory a British colony can call its own, and failing our compliance with its findings war by land and sea with Great Britain. Can those be serious words addressed to us by the descendants of the little shipload of English folk 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."

The paper concludes thus: "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 mother land over an obscure, trumpery dispute in which the United States has no right; but the message cannot obscure or defeat the affection which subsists between the two countries, the ties of blood that must needs bind them in in indissoluble union."

The Standard will say: "Most Englishmen will read the message with unfeigned astonishment. The position taken up by Mr. Cleveland is preposterous. No citizen of the United States would for a moment dream of admitting its soundness in any analogous case in which the interest or honor of his own country was concerned. The most appropriate comment on the situation that would arise from a recognition of the Cleveland dogma is presented by the concluding words of the message. The language may be a trifle turgid, but the sentiment is wholesome. Yet it is to this act of self-abasement that the President imagines he is entitled to bring Great Britain. 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."

The Telegraph will say: "The United States have no practical concern in the controversy. The invocation of the Monroe doctrine seems, on our side of the water, to be irrelevant and absurd."

The Graphic says: "Lord Salisbury has written the epitaph of the Monroe doctrine. Self-respecting Americans will not read President Cleveland with either pride or pleasure."

The Times will say: "It is impossible to disguise the gravities of the differences that have arisen between this country and the United States. The message of President Cleveland transmitted to Congress, and the reception of it by both sides in the Senate, give additional importance to the dispatches that have passed between the State Department at Washington and the Foreign Office. The details of the boundary dispute with Venezuela are insignificant in comparison with the far-reaching claim put forward in Mr. Olney's dispatch and emphasized in Mr. Cleveland's message. Convinced as we are that a rupture between the two great English-speaking communities would be a calamity not only to themselves, but to the civilized world, we are nevertheless driven to the conclusion that the concessions that this country is imperiously summoned to make are such as no self-respecting nation, and least of all one ruling an empire that has roots in every quarter of the globe, could possibly submit to. The United States themselves would never for a moment dream of yielding to this kind of dictation. We are of the same blood, and shall not be less careful of our national honor. We can hardly believe that the course threatened by Mr. Cleveland will be seriously adopted by the American Government, but, if so, it will be incumbent upon us, without entering upon such aggressive measures, to protect our imperial interests and stand up for our rights under international law. Lord Salisbury expresses his full concurrence with the view that the disturbance of territory in the Western Hemisphere by fresh acquisition on the part of Europe is highly inexpedient but the recognition of this expediency does not cover the preposterous deductions from the Monroe doctrine which Mr. Olney's dispatch puts forward and Mr. Cleveland makes the basis of the most astounding proposal that perhaps ever has been advanced by any Government in time of peace since the days of Napoleon."

INDORSED BY REPUBLICANS.

Senators Concur in the Sentiments of President Cleveland.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The mere question of the adoption of the report of the Senate Committee did not consume the two hours during which the Republicans of the Senate were behind closed doors this evening. They were occupied at something of vastly more importance to the whole American people. The President's message was up for consideration, and there proved to be an absolute unanimity of sentiment among them on the question of indorsing the President in the stand he had taken.

The discussion was precipitated by the motion of Mr. Lodge that the Chairman of the committee be requested to confer with Mr. Gorman, with a view to having the Committee on Foreign Relations recognized before the holiday recess, so that the matters set out in the message might be considered by that committee, the urgency of the situation having been recognized when Mr. Morgan, earlier in the day, asked and obtained leave for the committee to sit during the recess.

Speeches were made by Mr. Lodge, Mr. Frye, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Teller and several others, and everyone of them breathed the utmost loyalty to the President. The fact was called to the attention of the Republicans that they had been taunting the President with being away on a duck-hunting trip while matters of the greatest moment were transpiring; that Secretary Carlisle had been criticised for not sending in his annual report as required by law; that the general policy of the Administration has been denounced as un-American and weak, and that now the President has returned, and almost instantly laid before the Senate a message full of sentiments that must be indorsed by every patriotic man in the whole country, regardless of politics or party.

If England was to be impressed with the fact that this country indorsed its President; if that Government was to understand that the message was not a campaign letter intended for mere political effect, the Senate must take the matter up and proceed with it with all possible speed consistent with the vital importance of the subject. The argument was made that it would not do for this message to be neglected.

Such is a brief outline of the sentiments expressed at this caucus. The war spirit is abroad so far as the Republicans are concerned, and some of the speeches made would make the most interesting reading that has gone from this city for weeks. So imbued were the Republicans with the importance of the situation, and the need of further conference, that the matter will be again discussed at the caucus which has been called for to-morrow morning, mainly for this purpose.

AMERICAN PRESS COMMENT.

NEW YORK, Dec. 17.—The New York papers comment as follows:

The Sun: "Mr. Cleveland has borrowed a new uniform, but all the same it is the American uniform, and the country will follow the man who wears it. For the Monroe doctrine, as enunciated in the President's message, except for a line or two that we need not consider here, the people of the United States are solid and enthusiastic. And the continuation of this interesting and important business by the Administration will be watched and sustained with an unfaltering spirit of pride and determination to uphold the interests of the United States. Let the good work go on."

The Times: "As it stands to-day in the message of the President, it is a grave assertion that the United States will see justice done, neither asking more nor accepting less, to any independent State on this continent. To that principle, soon or late, we believe Great Britain will assent. By that principle, in any event, the American Nation will stand."

The Tribune: "We do not know that any 'jingo' Senator or Representative has 'reaffirmed the Monroe doctrine' in more direct and unmistakable terms. The President has spoken straightforward, manly words, which are worthy, and which we believe will command the approval and enthusiastic support of the people of the United States."

The Herald: "Both in this country and Great Britain the people and their official representatives will have an opportunity to reflect soberly and patriotically on an issue fraught with such grave consequences to both nations. Menacing as is the aspect which affairs have now assumed, it is to be hoped that the issue may be settled without disturbing the friendly relations existing between the two countries."

CHICAGO, Dec. 17.—The Inter Ocean will say: "The President's message clearly indicates a determination for the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine. If the territory in dispute belongs of right to a sister republic, then the United States is bound, for the protection of its own form of government against foreign invasions and intrigues, to prevent new occupation or invasion of any part of this continent by a European Power."

The Times-Herald: "The nation is with the President. It makes no difference to us whether or not any foreign Government may decline to admit the validity of the Monroe doctrine. We are not capable of the puerility of entreating recognition of it as a favor. We are prepared to demonstrate its validity with the entire strength of a sovereign people. Its assertion and enforcement are necessary to our place in the world."

The Record: "In a message which for force and directness has not been surpased by any of Mr. Cleveland's previous State papers, the President has reaffirmed the Monroe doctrine and struck the key note of the Venezuelan controversy with an emphasis that will ring on the startled ears of the British Ministry. If our Congress remains steadfast in support of the President's policy, the effect of this message will be the final establishment of the Monroe doctrine beyond any nation's power to dispute."

The Tribune: "To Lord Salisbury's claims President Cleveland makes a strong, dignified and determined reply, the meaning of which is that this country will 'stand pat'—that is, that Congress should proceed to enforce the principle of the Monroe doctrine as a matter of vital concern to the people and the safety of the Government. There need be no fear that this Republican Congress will not stand by the President in his patriotic American attitude. If Great Britain refuses to accept the Monroe doctrine, 'let her bring on her bears.' She will find Uncle Sam ready to receive them."

Fire at Decoto.

DECOTO, Dec. 17.—The general merchandise store of Frank Ribera was burned at 4 o'clock this morning. The store of W. B. King, adjoining, was saved by a hard fight. The building was owned by E. Salz. The barber shop in the same building was owned by M. Brown and all was lost. The fire is thought to be incendiary, as an attempt was made three months ago to burn the place by saturating it with coal oil. The loss is about $2,000, and the insurance $1,200.

RIOTING AT PHILADELPHIA.

Lawlessness Marks the Opening Day of the Great Street Railway Strike.

ABOUT THREE HUNDRED CARS WERE BADLY WRECKED.

A Policeman's Club Taken Away From Him and the Officer Beaten Into Insensibility—The Lines of the Union Traction Company Completely Tied Up—Not a Car Running in the City Except by One Company Not Involved in the Strike.

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 17.—Riot and destruction marked the opening of the great strike of the street car employes of the Union Traction Company. Aided by the mischievous, lawless element, the strikers succeeded to-day in completely tying up the lines of the Union Traction Company, and, with the exception of the one line not controlled of the company involved in the strike, not a wheel is turning in Philadelphia. To the credit of the strikers, it may be said that the disorders were created by too ardent sympathizers and mischievous boys. About 300 cars were badly wrecked.

This afternoon 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 added that violence and riot would be met with force, and that the peace of the city will be preserved at all hazards.

The suddenness of the numerous outbreaks to-day 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 reserve patrolmen were massed at every threatened point, and to-night every policeman is on duty.

The company made no attempt to run cars to-night, but under police protection they will start the Market-street branch of their line to-morrow morning, and trouble is sure to follow.

Despite the stone throwing, only one person was hurt, a policeman, who had his club taken away from by the crowd and was beaten into insensibility, and to-night is in the hospital with a concussion of the brain. The police made about 100 arests, and all the rioters were held in heavy bail.

The streets were thronged with people to-night, but there was no disturbance up to a late hour to-night.

IN CONGRESS.

Cleveland's Message Greeted With Heartiest Applause.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The demonstration which followed the reading of President Cleveland's message in the Senate to-day was strongly indicative of the general sentiment. Without any division on party lines, and with the Republicans even more pronounced in their applause than the Democrats, the message met the heartiest approval—nearly all the Senators clapping their hands and giving other evidences of gratification, while the few spectators in the galleries—the doors of which had been opened only five minutes before—joined in the applause without any apprehension of being reproved by the presiding officer. The strongest expressions in the message were those that were most favored. Among them were the following sentences:

"The course to be pursued by this Government, in view of the present condition, does not appear to admit of serious doubt."

"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 treaty divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana."

"It will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist by every measure in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of Governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela."

It was in connection with this last sentence that Senator Morgan of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, remarked, in an undertone, that there was no mistaking the meaning of that, and that Senator Frye (Rep.) of Maine remarked: "That is capital."

The message and correspondence were reported to the Committee on Foreign Relations with permission to the committee to sit during any recess.

While in executive session, the Senate extended for a period of one year the treaty between this country and Mexico relative to the work of the Boundary Commission. There was nothing else in to-day's session of the Senate that rose beyond the level of routine business, and as, after the reading of the message, Senators had no inclination to continue such work, the Senate at 1:20 p. m. adjourned until to-morrow.

IN THE HOUSE.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—When the President's message accompanying the Salisbury correspondence was read in the House its firm tone created a mild sensation, although it has been stated by Administration men recently that its sentiments would gratify the most ardent "Jingoists." Its reading evoked hearty applause. The message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and at 4:50 o'clock the House adjourned until to-morrow.

SENATE COMMITTEES.

The Republican Caucus Decides the Question of Chairmanships.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The Republicans of the Senate in caucus this afternoon adopted the report of the committee appointed to fill the vacancies in the Senate committees. There was not a dissenting vote, although Chairman Morrill of Finance, Frye of Commerce and Hoar of Judiciary, thought it was unwise to enlarge the committees over which they preside. There are sixty committees in the Senate. Of these forty-three chairmanships have been given to Republicans, six to Populists and eleven to Democrats. Each vacancy was filled, seven places being assigned to some Senators and six to some others, with the understanding that should Utah send two Republican Senators, and should a Republican be admitted from Delaware, places could be made for these Senators by resignation on the part of the Senators having an excess of assignments.

The committee agreed on every matter that came before it, but the one proposition, to wit: To change the name of the select committee to inquire into all claims of citizens of the United States against the Government of Nicaragua, to the "select committee on the Nicaraguan Canal and to inquire into claims of citizens of the United States against the Government of Nicaragua." They proposed to increase the committee from five to seven and give the minority the chairmanship, and the Republicans four members. This would make Senator Morgan chairman, and throw to this committee all that portion of the work of the Foreign Relations Committee relating to the canal heretofore considered by that committee. This matter will be determined at the caucus to be held to-morrow immediately after the Senate adjourns.

BRITISH STEAMSHIP TAFNA.

Totally Wrecked and Fourteen of Her Crew Lost.

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 17.—The British steamship Tafna, Captain Richard, arrived to-day from St. Michael's, and had on board six survivors of the crew of the German ship Athena, which was totally wrecked on December 15th.

The Athena was laden with naphtha, and, after being dismasted in a gale, and while the crew were about to be transferred to the Tafna, the naphtha exploded, blowing the ship out of the water, killing or drowning fourteen men. The Athena was bound from New York for London.

The survivors are: Alexander Franzelius, first mate; Johann Freese, second mate; William Muller, carpenter; John Rudsit, seaman; Martin Penneller, seaman; George Schroeder, seaman.

The lost are: Captain G. Haak of Bremen, Germany; G. Henke, Fritz Nehring, Hans Koenig, John Svensen, John Andersen, Johan Vogler, H. Wahlen, Charles Kohnler, Hans Ismussen, Wilhelm Hens, Bernard Peckctein and Herman Halset, —— Lundman.

The Athena was loaded with 9,000 barrels of naphtha at Wiliamsburg, Long Island. The cargo was valued at $45,000, and the consignees were Theodore Ruger & Co. of New York. The Athena sailed on December 10th for London.

UNION PACIFIC.

Special Meeting of the Reorganization Committee.

NEW YORK, Dec. 17.—A special meeting of the Union Pacific Reorganization Committee was held this morning. The depositaries reported a very considerable and constant increase both in the foreign and home deposits, and there appears now no longer any doubt that a majority of the first mortgage bonds will shortly be under the control of the committee; in fact, it is understood that the committee already holds a majority of what is considered the most important division of the system.

After the meeting a member of the committee said, informally, that the privilege to bondholders to come into the reorganization instead of having their bonds paid off is considered so very valuable that even with the penalty which it is the intention to impose after January 1st the inclination within the committee appears to be not to extend this privilege to minority bondholders for any length of time.

HAMILTON COLLEGE.

Annual Banquet and Reunion of the Alumni Association.

KANSAS CITY (Mo.), Dec. 17.—The Alumni Association of Hamilton College held its annual banquet and reunion at the Midland Hotel, this city, to-night. About twenty-five graduates of this famous old school were present, and sat down to an elaborate banquet.

After the banquet informal addresses were made, the principal one being that of Rev. M. Wilsey Stryker, D.D., LL.D., President of Hamilton College. Others who spoke were: Rev. H. D. Jenkins, D.D., and Clarence S. Palmer of this city, Rev. C. C. Heminway, D.D., of Glasgow, Mo., Channing J. Brown, Clerk of the Supreme Court of Topeka, Kas., and Major C. M. Wilson of Kansas City, Kas.

Rev. Dr. Stryker's remarks were particularly happy, abounding in the brilliant and sententious passages for which he is famous wherever known, and they proved him to have been a worthy successor of the late Professor Swing in the old Fourth Church of Chicago.

ON THE TURF.

Results of Yesterday's Races at the Ingleside Track.

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 17.—An abundance of slush and several upsets were the features of the racing at Ingleside to-day. Of six favorites sent to the post, but two were returned winners.

Five furlongs, selling, Julia O. (15 to 1) won, imp. Amarino (50 to 1) second, Realization (9 to 10) third. Time—1:19. Johnny Payne, Examiner, Centurion, Podiga, Zaragosa also ran.

Five furlongs, selling, Summer Time (3 to 1) won, Easel (50 to 1) second, La Viente (3½ to 1) third. Time—1:05. Pique, Laura F., Princess Rose II., Free Will, Tiny, New Moon, Tennessee Maid also ran.

One mile, handicap, Libertine (10 to 1) won, Sister Mary (16 to 1) second, Vinctor (2 to 1) third. Time—1:04½. Kamsin, Governor Budd, Joan, Benham, Rummel, Sylvia, Long Lady, Encino also ran.

Mile and a furlong, selling, Thornhill (8 to 5) won, Pepper (6 to 5) second, Cadmus (15 to 1) third. Time—2:00. Mary S., Remus, Salonica also ran.

Six furlongs, selling, Sligo (3 to 1) won, Yemen (11 to 5) second, Pat Murphy (5 to 1) third. Time—1:17½. Candor, Charmion, Ike L., Monterey also ran.

TO-DAY'S ENTRIES.

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 17.—Following are the entries and weights for tomorrow's races at Ingleside:

First race, five-eighths of a mile, Peixotto (104), Rey de Apache (112), Adolph Spreckels (115), Mount McGregor (107), Skalkaho (107), Hazard (107), Duchess (104), Jim Budd (107), Mabel L. (104), Globe (112), El Carmer (112).

Second race, three-fourths of a mile, selling, Montana (107), Royal Flush (107), Minnie C. (104), Jake Johnson (104), Arundel (110), George Miller (104), Oregon Eclipse (107), Carmel (107), Highland (104), Ricardo (104), W. L. Munson (104).

Third race, Navy Blue (100), Roma (100), Dungarven (115), Pescador (107), Moderico (95), Sister Mary (109), Olivia (95), Jack Richelieu (107), Santiago (115).

Fourth race, three-fourths of a mile, Schnitz (107), Collins (104), Toby (104), Allahabad (104), Miss Garvin (104), Detective (104), Shield Bearer (107).

OFFICERS SHOT

While Trying to Arrest a Saloon-Keeper at San Diego.

SAN DIEGO, Dec. 17.—Police officers John McInnes and W. I. Warner and a soldier were shot and wounded about 12 o'clock last night by Frank Wilson in the latter's saloon on Fifth street, between J and K. None of the wounds are dangerous, but the officers will be laid up for some time. Warner narrowly escaped death. The officers were trying to arrest Wilson at the time the shooting began. Wilson held out until daylight this morning, when he surrendered and was taken to the County Jail.