"IF YOU SEE IT IN The Sun IT'S SO."

The Sun.

THE WEATHER PREDICTION
For New York and Its Vicinity:
Warmer; fair; southerly winds.

VOL. LXIII.—NO. 109. NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1895.—COPYRIGHT, 1895, BY THE SUN PRINTING AND PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION. PRICE TWO CENTS.

JOHN BULL IS ANGRY.

London Believes Lord Salisbury Will Not Recede.

A CHALLENGE TO ENGLAND.

Many Think the Message to Congress Clearly Means War.

All Political Parties Will Doubtless Support Lord Salisbury—Men at the Political Clubs Were First Surprised, Then Indignant—Some Newspapers Think the Message Is a Menace, and Others that the President Has Not Committed Himself—The Chronicle Says the Message Cannot Obscure Our Mutual Affection—The Daily News Thinks the President Is Trying to Put the Republican Party in a Hole—The Standard Says Mr. Cleveland's Position is Preposterous, and that England Declines to Humiliate Herself—"We Cannot Possibly Withdraw Our Protection from British Subjects Who Have Settled Up to the Schomburgk Line—Beyond the Line We Are Quite Ready to Accept Arbitration"—The Times Says It Is Impossible to Disguise the Gravity of the Case.

Special Cable Despatch to THE SUN.

LONDON, Dec. 17.—Just after 6 o'clock this evening the Hon. Bernard Eric Barrington of London, Lord Salisbury's bland and astute private secretary, gave out to a couple of favored newspaper men twenty-four pages of blue foolscap, bound, but without a cover, and labelled "Correspondence respecting the question of the boundary between Venezuela and the colony of British Guiana." Mr. Barrington's manner was impressive and gave the reporters the idea that they had got hold of a good thing, and so it proved.

Two hours later the official *London Gazette* was published with the same despatches, but by that time the news cablegrams had arrived from Washington, and great excitement prevailed in every editor's room in Fleet street, and the leading members of the various staffs were in consultation as to the treatment of the international question which, heretofore regarded with very languid interest, had suddenly and inexplicably assumed a most dangerous phase.

The editors of the Ministerial organs hurried off to Downing street for inspiration, but, as far as can be ascertained, none of them received it. Mr. Barrington had not gone home to dinner.

Lord Salisbury was at his country seat at Hatfield, and a summary of President Cleveland's message to Congress reached him while he was at dinner. Whether it affected the British Premier's eating powers, which normally are not inconsiderable, THE SUN reporter is not in a position to announce.

Meanwhile the Central News had distributed the gist of President Cleveland's message over its column-printing machines to all the great political clubs. The sensation caused was immediate, palpable, and profound. Men stood around the news boards and gazed aghast at what they read. Many in their first surprise declared that the message spelled war. Soon astonishment gave place to anger, and as I cable the jingo feeling is general and at fever heat.

It is impossible to doubt that the message will be regarded here as a challenge which England ought to take up, and that Lord Salisbury will receive the support, practically, of all the political parties, unless all appearances to-night are deceptive. To-morrow's newspapers, London and provincial, will all be strongly bellicose.

The strength of the Government's Parliamentary majority does not tend to guarantee prudent treatment of the subject by Lord Salisbury. It is an open secret that he regards most of his Cabinet colleagues as ciphers, and there is every reason to believe that Secretary Olney's despatch and Lord Salisbury's two replies thereto come as a complete surprise to all the Ministers except the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Arthur Balfour, and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. As to the general public, it had never supposed for a moment that there was the slightest danger in the paltry Venezuela question.

There was a meeting of the Ministers on Saturday, Nov. 16, at which about half the Cabinet was present, but there is not the slightest reason to suppose that Venezuela was then discussed. Queen Victoria had arrived at Windsor from Scotland on the same morning, and the Ministers were, doubtless, occupied with the necessary business connected with the Privy Council summoned for the following Thursday. In the interval Lord Salisbury undoubtedly conferred with Mr. Balfour and the Liberal-Unionist leaders, and, in all probability, it was the draft of the Foreign Minister's replies to Secretary Olney which the Duke of Devonshire submitted to the Queen in the private audience which, it is now learned, he had with the Queen previous to the Council meeting on Nov. 21.

Foreign Office opinion was unobtainable to-night, but in other and responsible official quarters there is a mighty pretence to treat the message and its menaces lightly. "All depends," said one Government departmental chief, "upon whether Mr. Cleveland really intends to stand for a third term. If so, there is real danger to be apprehended from the position assumed by the United States. If not, Englishmen may rest assured that the whole thing is merely a mean dodge by the retiring President to leave a legacy of difficulty to his Republican successor."

It is needless to say that the dominant idea here is that patriotism is a purely British product, unknown in the United States, where political corruption is universal and rampant and no public man is ever swayed by anything but sordid self-interest.

BRITISH COMMENTS.

Views of the Leading Newspapers on the President's Message.

LONDON, Dec. 18.—The *Chronicle* says: "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."

The *Chronicle* describes Lord Salisbury's despatch as most temperate, and refers to the limitation to the Schomburgk line as a concession that only a strong State could have granted to a weak one. It adds: "We cannot abandon our settlers any more than President Cleveland would his."

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 motherland over an obscure, trumpery dispute in which the United States has no real interest. But the message cannot defeat or obscure the affection which subsists between the two countries, or break the ties of blood that must needs bind them in indissoluble union."

THE DAILY NEWS.

The *Daily News* says:

"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 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 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 the 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 despatch.

"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 President in his account of the doctrine surrenders the whole case. What Monroe meant was that the United States would resent any European attempt to establish monarchical systems in hostile communities on the American continent. That was a serious consideration in 1823. It is altogether obsolete now, but what has all this to do with the boundaries of Venezuela? The President proves too much. It follows from the message that Guiana, and, indeed, Canada, have no right of independent existence on American soil.

"Mr. Cleveland begs the whole question and misrepresents it besides when he says that this country is seeking to extend the limits of British Guiana. This country is doing nothing of the kind. Venezuela claims territory that is now Guianese and British. If to resist this claim be a breach of the Monroe doctrine, that doctrine is an intolerable pretence.

"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 unskilful. It 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 denouncing them as being servile friends of the British. But the great body of the American public will not be led by any such motives or considerations. The ordinary American citizen cares nothing for Venezuela and has no feeling against this country. He might be very jealous for the Monroe doctrine when it really defended American interests, but the idea of making himself responsible for the concerns of every South American republic is too absurd for him to regard it seriously.

"It is not correct to say that Lord Salisbury has altogether rejected the idea of arbitration. On the contrary, he has partially accepted it."

The paper quotes from Lord Salisbury's despatch to support this contention, and proceeding, says:

"We believe that Lord Salisbury's firm and moderate statement of the case will appeal to the justice and common sense of the American people. The principle of international arbitration has always been warmly supported in these columns, but if it is invoked for frivolous, fantastic demands it will lose its authority and become a by-word instead of an ideal."

THE MORNING POST.

The *Morning Post* says: "President Cleveland has outdone the Republican party in his efforts to show dislike for this country, yet he has not committed himself to anything. The message does not make the slightest attempt to grapple with Lord Salisbury's argument that the United States cannot find any excuse in the language of the Monroe doctrine for their appearance on the scene, or that, if they could give the old President's words any such extension, his declaration has no authority. The international law tribunal that President Cleveland asks the Congress to set up can have no more binding effect in this country than would a decision by the Supreme Court at Washington."

THE STANDARD.

The *Standard* says: "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," which the paper quotes, adding:

"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 its jurisdiction.

"If it could reasonably be made out that the pretension of the State Department to enforce arbitration throughout the American continent had any color in the Monroe doctrine, such an application of the principle would be a *reductio ad absurdum* of a cherished maxim.

"Happily, however, for the sobriety and endurance of the traditions of American diplomacy, Lord Salisbury has effectively disposed of the delusion that the Monroe doctrine is in any way pertinent to the question of the Guiana-Venezuela frontier.

"As regards the precise cause of the difference with Venezuela, we believe we have a perfectly stainless record. Mr. Olney, to do him justice, refuses to take it for granted that Venezuela has substantiated her case against us, though Mr. Cleveland, with a loss of perception, chooses to assume that our action is in derogation of the rights of the little republic.

"As British subjects have settled up to the Schomburgk 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.

"This, however, would be of no avail. Venezuela sets up pretensions which, if found valid, would involve the absorption of half of our colony, if not the territory of our Dutch and French neighbors.

"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."

THE TELEGRAPH.

The *Telegraph* says: "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.

"If it is in any sense true that all this zealous support of Venezuela owes its origin to partisan intrigues, there is still less reason for submitting to what, from the British standpoint, is a wholly perverse and inadmissible claim."

THE GRAPHIC.

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

THE TIMES.

The *Times* says: "It is impossible to disguise the gravities of the difficulties that have arisen between this country and the United States.

"The message that President Cleveland transmitted to Congress and the reception it met from both sides in the Senate give additional importance to the despatches 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 claims put forward in Mr. Olney's despatch 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 any aggressive measures, to protect our imperial interest and stand up for our rights under international law.

"It must be observed that the Monroe doctrine, on which Mr. Olney relies, has received an entirely new development. The statement in his despatch and in Mr. Cleveland's message that the doctrine is admitted by all the highest authorities, has never been recognized, even in its original form, as a rule of international law.

"Lord Salisbury expresses the full concurrence with the view that the disturbance of territory in the western hemisphere by fresh acquisition on the part of European States is highly inexpedient, but the recognition of this inexpediency does not cover the preposterous deductions from the Monroe doctrine which Mr. Olney's despatch puts forward, and Mr. Cleveland makes the basis of the most astounding proposal that, perhaps, has ever been advanced by any Government in time of peace since the days of Napoleon."

After a summarized review of the despatches and message the *Times* continues:

"We desire to speak with all proper reserve of what is still, in the form at least, of diplomatic negotiations; but we can confidently predict that the pretensions thus put forward by the President and apparently acclaimed by the Senate and, with rare exceptions, hailed by the press on both sides as vigorous and patriotic, will not be admitted by this country.

"The firm though temperate language of Lord Salisbury's reply to Mr. Olney indicates how he is likely to receive the proposal to give effect in an offensive, overweening way to the new construction of the Monroe doctrine.

"No Commission appointed by a power which is not a party to the dispute will be recognized by us as having title of any sort to pronounce upon controverted questions of the boundary between the British empire and Venezuela.

"It will receive no assistance from the British authorities and will have to rely on what it can obtain from the Venezuelans. Its decision will be null and void from the outset, even if its origin did not taint it with partiality. This new departure in international relations does not appear to be a straightforward course.

"It is for the United States to decide for themselves whether the Venezuelan boundary dispute touches their interests, though we are unable to see how it does so.

It is for them to declare that they are allies of Venezuela and support her alleged rights. We should then know where we stand.

"But to assume authority in a quasi-judicial way upon the validity of our territorial rights in another continent is a pretension that no power in the world can be justified in advancing.

"We are bound to resist the claims which the Monroe doctrine has for the first time been extended to cover, and to which Mr. Olney has added comments and inferences against which an emphatic protest must be made."

The *Times* refers to the cool assumption based upon a distance of 3,000 miles, and continues:

"A power which has command of the sea does not regard the 3,000 miles of intervening ocean as severing it from its subjects. The American tradition will not be strengthened by Mr. Olney's claim of moral superiority on the ground that self-government is only enjoyed by republics.

"We think we have something like self-government here, even though we have not yet developed a Tammany Hall, and we are vain enough to believe that liberty is more real and healthy in Great Britain than in Venezuela.

"These unnecessary aggressive assertions seem to point to the possibility that this sudden offensive movement on the part of the United States has more to do with party politics than with diplomacy.

"Much may be pardoned, in view of the approaching election, which, to a large extent, explains the union of the Republicans and Democrats in raising a Jingo cry.

"It is to be remembered, moreover, that a good deal of time must elapse before a commission can be appointed, and that it will be a still longer time before it can report. It may not come into existence, indeed, until the Executive has passed into other hands.

"In the meanwhile the sober common sense of the American people, we should hope, will condemn the attempt to pick a quarrel with a friendly power. In any case our own course is clear.

"We must stand firmly and calmly upon our rights as an independent State, and, if necessary, take practical measures to assert them.

"It may even be expedient to settle the frontier question by drawing a line of our own. Of course, there can be no thought of anything other than the Schomburgk line, and allowing the United States and Venezuela to deal with matters as they may."

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS SENTIMENT.

Everybody Anxious to Uphold the President in His New Attitude.

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 afternoon. They were occupied with something of vastly more importance to the 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 endorsing 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 reorganized before the holiday recess, so that the matters set out in the President's 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 other Senators, and every one of them breathed the utmost loyalty to the President in the stand he had taken. 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 criticized for not sending in his annual report as required by law; that the general policy of the Administration had been denounced as un-American and weak, and that now the President had returned and almost at once laid before the Senate a message that must be endorsed by every patriotic citizen in the whole country regardless of politics or party.

If England was to be impressed with the fact that this country endorsed its President; if that Government was to understand that this 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 followed by any absolute abandonment of all work. The country and England should know that the Senate took the message as a serious thing, involving matters of such vast importance and so portentious in the results that might grow from it, that the duly constituted committees of Congress proposed to be constantly on duty and always ready to hold up the hands of the Chief Magistrate.

Such is a brief outline of the sentiment expressed at the caucus.

WON'T DISCUSS THE MESSAGE.

Two Consuls Here Diplomatically Silent, but Much Interested.

Mr. Percy Sanderson, the British Consul-General here, remained at his office, 24 State street, until 5 P. M. yesterday, two hours longer than usual. He sent out word that he had nothing to say about the President's message. When he came out he consented to read the headlines in an afternoon paper telling the substance of the message. All the afternoon papers had been in his office several hours, and he had sent two cable messages to England.

The Venezuelan Consul here said it would not be diplomatic for him to say anything on the message. He referred all reporters to the Venezuelan Minister at Washington. He was willing to say, and he smiled broadly as he said it, that he had read the message, and, personally, was much pleased with it.

ADMIRAL BELKNAP'S APPROVAL.

He Says that Now We Have Got to Stand by Our Guns.

BOSTON, Dec. 17.—Rear Admiral George E. Belknap, U. S. N., retired, was found by a SUN reporter at his house, 1,055 Beacon street, this evening. He had just finished reading the President's message. He said:

"I endorse every word of it. We have proclaimed the Monroe doctrine for the past seventy-five years, and now we've got to stand by our guns. I think the entire people of the country will endorse the stand the President has taken.

"War is a very serious matter and a very great calamity, but cowardice and dishonor in a great nation are far worse.

"We hold, by reason of our situation, our wealth, population, and resources, a place among the foremost powers of the earth, and we are in duty bound to maintain and to add to such position; wherefore Great Britain must be made to understand that she must respect the rights, the dignity, and the power of this people and Government."

M'KINLEY COMMENDS IT.

Says the Message Will Command the Approval of the People of Ohio.

COLUMBUS, Dec. 17.—Gov. McKinley, when asked to-night for an expression of opinion touching President Cleveland's Venezuela message, said:

"It is my judgment that the President's firm and dignified statement of the adherence of our Government to the Monroe doctrine will command the approval of the people of Ohio.

"His message enforces with strength and vigor the position of the United States in its relations with European powers for more than seventy years. It is American in letter and spirit, and in a calm and dispassionate manner upholds the honor of the nation and insures its security."

CONFEDERATE VETS WOULD GO.

They Will Raise a Company in This City in Case of War.

At a special meeting of the Confederate Veterans' Camp of New York, held last evening at the St. James Hotel, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, The message of the President transmitted this day to Congress marks the critical stage in our relations with Great Britain, and while we trust that the difficulty may be amicably adjusted to the satisfaction and honor of the two greatest nations of the earth, be it

Resolved, That the President has taken a position heartily endorsed by us, and from which there should be no step backward; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the Confederate Veterans' Camp of New York, do pledge ourselves, in the event of war, to raise in New York and offer to the President a company of Confederate veterans to battle for the honor of our country and the glory of our flag.

BEARS HAMMER STOCKS.

Wall Street Awaits with Interest the Effect on Foreign Exchanges.

Wall street people were very much interested in President Cleveland's message on the Venezuela question. As soon as its purport was known the bears climbed in and hammered the stock market, and values responded to their efforts.

Just why the bears took this course they themselves could not explain, except that they feared that this morning would bring free selling orders of American securities from London.

As a matter of fact, the best-informed people in Wall street said that London for some time had been pretty bare of American securities, and that its financiers had very few of our securities to sell.

Nevertheless, the majority in Wall street said that they would be very much interested in reading this morning's cable despatches from the London Stock Exchange and also from the Paris, Berlin, and Vienna bourses.

They are more than ordinarily interested to ascertain the reflection of opinion in these foreign financial centres on the probable effect of Mr. Cleveland's message.

The bulls said that with war between the United States and England the United States would quickly find itself on a silver basis, and then instantly would follow the greatest period of inflation that Wall street has seen in forty years.

The Message and the Gold Reserve.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The opinion is expressed in Treasury circles that the President's message to Congress to-day on the Venezuelan boundary question will cause the return by English holders of American securities and stocks for sale, and thus further deplete the Treasury gold reserve, as gold would have to be sent abroad in payment of them.

Gov. Oates Thinks England Will Back Down

MONTGOMERY, Ala., Dec. 17.—Gov. Oates said to-night that he endorsed every word of Mr. Cleveland's message.

"If Congress stands to him, and I believe Democrats and Republicans alike will, England will simply have to back down or fight, and I predict she will select the former course. I believe all patriotic Americans will endorse the President's declarations."

Politics Are Mighty Uncertain,

But you may bank on Biker's Expectorant every time as a certain cure for a cough or cold, croup, bronchitis, or pneumonia.—*Adv.*

A New Safe Deposit Company.

The Merchants' Safe Deposit Company will occupy spacious apartments in the Wool Exchange Building, West Broadway, and have given contract to the Herring Safe Works for one of the largest and strongest fire and burglar proof vaults in the city.—*Adv.*

There are some unusually interesting anecdotes of stage celebrities with beautiful portraits in the January *Five Cent Nickell Magazine.*—*Adv.*

WE FACE ENGLAND.

Hands Off Venezuela! Is Cleveland's Message.

IS THERE WAR IN SIGHT?

No Calamity So Bad as Supine Submission, Says the President.

The Boundary Dispute, He Recommends, Should Be Submitted to a United States Commission, and by that Commission's Decision We Should Stand at All Hazards—"In Making These Recommendations," He Writes, "I Am Fully Alive to the Responsibility Incurred and Keenly Realize All the Consequences that May Follow"—Applause for the Message in Congress and Universal Praise Outside—Secretary Olney's Powerful Presentation of the Monroe Doctrine in His Communication to Salisbury on the Venezuelan Question Last Summer—Salisbury's Voluminous Reply Culminating in the Familiar Refusal to Arbitrate the Quarrel—War Talk in the Navy—Joy of South and Central American Diplomatists.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The President's vigorous war message, as it has been called many times to-day, written by Secretary Olney while Mr. Cleveland was absent on his duck-hunting expedition and signed by the President at one of the several conferences with the Secretary of State yesterday, was sent to both Houses of Congress to-day to accompany the correspondence between Lord Salisbury and Secretary Olney in regard to the boundary dispute between England and Venezuela.

That the aggressive and patriotic tone of the message and the able presentation of the American side of the controversy contained in Secretary Olney's note of July last, met with the general approval and endorsement of the two Houses of Congress, was plain enough. In the Senate, where the message was promptly read in open session as soon as it was found that its contents had already been published by the newspapers, the precedent of many long years was broken and the hand clapping of the Senators on both sides of the Chamber, strictly unsenatorial and in violation of the rules of the body as it undoubtedly was, met a prompt echo in the applause from the occupants of the gallery. The gravity of the President's communication was so great and it dealt with such a serious diplomatic question that the Senate was disposed at first to order the document to be read behind closed doors, but this was found to be useless as the newspapers had forestalled the reading clerk in giving its contents to the public. It was read in open session, therefore, and as soon as the applause that startled some of the more ancient Senators had died away, Vice-President Stevenson ordered the message and the accompanying documents to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Senator Morgan, the present Chairman of that committee, had already taken time by the forelock and secured authority for the committee to sit during the coming holiday recess. Before that recess is ordered, it is possible that the control of the committees of the Senate will have passed to the Republicans and that Mr. Sherman of Ohio, instead of Mr. Morgan of Alabama, will be Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. This is not important, however, in view of the fact that the new Chairman Senator is as strong a patriot as the old one, and the subject will receive as prompt and favorable consideration with Mr. Morgan's name at the foot of the list as if it were still at the top.

It is not unlikely, therefore, that very soon after the reconvening of Congress in January the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate will be ready to propose a plan to carry out the President's recommendations for the creation of a commission to locate definitely the Venezuelan boundary line, in order to demonstrate to the world that the claim of the United States Government that England is encroaching upon territory belonging to Venezuela, and thus violating the cardinal principle of the Monroe doctrine, is sound and unanswerable, and its enforcement by all possible means justifiable.

In the House of Representatives the spirit of Americanism and patriotism that was uppermost in the minds of members on both sides of the House was somewhat stifled by the action of Speaker Reed in not laying the message before that body until just before the hour of adjournment, late in the afternoon. A few of the more patriotic members of both parties, who got an inkling yesterday of the contents of the message and a hint that it would be submitted to Congress to-day, were ready to give it a rousing reception and indulge themselves in a vigorous waving of the American flag. When, however, the President's secretary appeared at the door of the House with the message under his arm, the first political row of the session was under way, the cause being over the proposition of the Republicans to authorize Speaker Reed to appoint three election committees instead of one for the purpose of hurrying through the thirty-two contested cases on the docket. Ex-Speaker Crisp, as spokesman for the Democrats, opposed the Republican proposition and fought it all day, even going to the extent of attempting to filibuster when forced to permit the question to come to a vote. It was nearly 5 o'clock when the Republican programme was agreed upon, and then Speaker Reed quietly laid before the House the message that had been all day lying on his table with the seals unbroken. Speaker Reed does not belong to the war party in the House, and looks with a somewhat cold and unsympathetic eye upon the efforts of his Republican associates to stir up a vigorous American sentiment in the House, but his feeling had nothing to do with the suppressing of the message. The Committee on Rules had the floor all day, and he could do nothing but allow the question under discussion to proceed to its legitimate conclusion. Before the message was submitted finally, therefore, it had been read by all the members in the newspapers, and the keen edge of enthusiasm by which its contents had been received earlier in the day had been worn off. Nevertheless there was considerable applauding, and at its close it was ordered referred to the Committee of Foreign Affairs "when appointed." Under different circumstances it is probable that the message would have been received with speeches of endorsement and that the House would have taken some step to indicate its intention to support the President enthusiastically in his attitude in the controversy. Indeed, ex-Speaker Crisp attempted to secure recognition in order to offer a resolution appropriating $100,000 for the expenses of the proposed Commission, but was cut off by a motion for adjournment by Dingley, the coming leader of the House.

Strangely enough the Republicans seem to be more enthusiastic in their expression of gratification and endorsements than the Democrats. Some of the Democrats criticise the logic of the President's conclusions, and call attention particularly to the alleged weakness of his proposition for a Commission to settle the question of the boundary line after having told England that it must arbitrate on the facts already known or fight.

One Senator said at the conclusion of the reading of the message:

"Well, that will make Cleveland President again."

"Oh, no," said a Democratic colleague beside him, "it will not make him President, but insures him a fourth nomination from the Democratic party and a certain candidacy for the third term."

All the Cuckoos in Congress at once took up this song and far and wide they carried the prediction that no other name than that of Grover Cleveland would be seriously considered at the next Democratic National Convention.

There is, of course, no question that the President's recommendation with regard to the creation of a boundary Commission will be carried into effect promptly and cheerfully, and this makes it almost certain that the final step in this diplomatic quarrel between the United States and Great Britain will be taken necessarily by Mr. Cleveland's successor in the Presidential office. Several months will be required for the necessary legislation, the organization of the Commission and its departure for Venezuela. Then will follow many months of weary painstaking labor in carrying out instructions of the State Department, and when the report of the Commission shall have been submitted another diplomatic correspondence will surely follow. This probably will carry the controversy into another Administration for final settlement. It is this proposition for the creation of a boundary Commission that serves to check partly the war talk in Washington to-night. Those who from the first have favored a vigorous enunciation of the Monroe doctrine and its strict enforcement with regard to the dispute between England and Venezuela are not now called Jingoists, but supporters of the Administration's foreign policy, and for the first time during his incumbency of the office of President Mr. Cleveland has outlined a policy that meets with the hearty endorsement of the great majority of all parties in Congress and the approval of the whole American people.

TEXT OF THE MESSAGE.

The Reading Accompanied with Signs of Strong Approval in Both Houses.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The demonstration which followed the reading of President Cleveland's Venezuelan 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 these 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 true 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 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 governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela."

It was regarding 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 Senator Frye (Rep., Maine) said: "That is capital."

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

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 till to-morrow.

The message on the Venezuelan boundary matter was then laid before the House and read by the Clerk after a partisan debate on election contests. When the portion declaring that the United States must properly deal with the situation as it exists was reached, there was a vigorous outburst of handclapping on the floor, Republican members leading. This was repeated, in an intensified form, over the declaration that the United States would resist, as an aggression upon its rights, any appropriation by Great Britain of territory found by the proposed Commission to belong to Venezuela, and again at the close.

Speaker Reed announced that the message and documents would be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Crisp (Dem., Ga.) endeavored to get recognition to offer a joint resolution appropriating $100,000 to pay the expenses of a Commission to be appointed by the President to investigate and report what is the true divisional line between the republic of Venezuela and British Guiana, but Mr. Dingley's motion to adjourn was put, and at 4:50 o'clock P. M. the House adjourned till to-morrow.

THE MESSAGE.

The message follows:

"*To the Congress:*

"In my annual message addressed to the 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 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 despatch 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 this doctrine is insisted on by the United States, that the reasons just being 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.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE STRONG AND 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 our 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.

EXACT FITNESS OF THE DOCTRINE NOW.

"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 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 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 counsels 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 claims which the justice of that code of law can find to be right and valid.

RECOGNIZED IN INTERNATIONAL LAW.

"The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in the 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 applicable to present conditions, states:

SALISBURY'S OBJECTIONS.

"'In declaring that the United States would resist any 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 the European States 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 state of the world's progress, and that it was directly related 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 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.

THE SITUATION TO BE ACCEPTED AND MET.

"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 me to be far from satisfactory. It is deeply disappointing that such an appeal, actuated by the most friendly feelings toward 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 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 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.

FOR A UNITED STATES COMMISSION.

"Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as