

THE PEOPLE'S PILOT.

FOR THE FREE AND UNLIMITED COINAGE OF SILVER AND GOLD AT THE PARITY RATIO OF SIXTEEN TO ONE WITHOUT REFERENCE TO ANY OTHER NATION ON EARTH.

VOL. V.

RENSSELAER, IND., THURSDAY, DEC. 19, 1895.

NUMBER 25.

BRITAIN IS WARNED.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S MESSAGE ON VENEZUELA.

European Nations Have No Rights on American Soil—Message Well Received in Senate and House—Comments of the American and British Press.

Washington, Dec. 18.—The President yesterday transmitted to congress a message on the Venezuelan controversy, together with the correspondence of Secretary Olney, Ambassador Bayard and the Marquis of Salisbury. The President's 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 dispatch to which it is a reply, is hereto appended. Such reply is embodied in two communications addressed by the British prime minister to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at this capital.

It will be seen that one of these communications is devoted exclusively to observations upon the Monroe doctrine, and claims that in the present instance a new and strange extension and development of this doctrine is insisted on by the United States, that the reasons justifying an appeal to the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe are generally inapplicable to the state of things in which we live in the present day, and especially inapplicable to a controversy involving 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 noninterference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their government. 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.

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.

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. 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.

It will be seen from the correspondence herewith submitted that this proposition has been declined by the Brit-

ish 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 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 result.

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. Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner I suggest that the congress make an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to be appointed by the executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay.

When such report is made and accepted it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a 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 belong to Venezuela.

In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow. I am nevertheless firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous 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 a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor beneath which is shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness.

GROVER CLEVELAND.
Executive Mansion, Dec. 17.

Accompanying the President's message is the correspondence on the subject. It starts with Secretary Olney's now celebrated note respecting the negotiations with Great Britain, looking to the arbitration of the boundary dispute, bears date of July 20 last and is addressed to Mr. Bayard.

The secretary begins by stating that the President has given much anxious thought to the subject and has not reached a conclusion without a lively sense of its great importance as well as of the serious possibility involved in any action now to be taken. He then comments on the long duration of the boundary dispute, the "indefinite" claims of both parties and "the continuous growth of the undefined British claims," the fate of the various attempts at arbitration of the controversy and the part in the matter heretofore taken by the United States. He shows that the British claims since the Schomburg line was run have moved the frontier of British Guiana farther and farther to the westward of the line proposed by Lord Aberdeen in 1844.

The secretary lays it down as a canon of international law that a nation may justly interpose in a controversy between other nations whenever "what is done or proposed by any of the parties primarily concerned is a serious and direct menace to its own integrity, tranquility or welfare." The propriety of the rule, when applied in good faith, will not be questioned in any quarter, though, he says, it has been given a wide scope and too often made a cloak for schemes of wanton spoliation and aggrandizement.

This leads him up to an elaborate review of the Monroe doctrine, and the secretary, stating that the proposition that America is no part open to colonization has long been conceded, says that our present concern is with the other practical application of the Monroe doctrine, viz., That American non-intervention in Europe necessarily implied European non-intervention in American affairs, the disregard of which is to be deemed an act of unkindness toward the United States. His position on the Monroe doctrine laid down, Secretary Olney goes at some length into the Venezuelan dispute, affirming that the British claim in two years apparently has expanded some 33,000 square miles, so as to command the mouth of the Orinoco, and dismissing as valueless the contention that Great Britain's possession of Venezuela gives it any right to be

treated as an American state. He says where Great Britain has arbitrated other boundary disputes, and declares that it, in effect, says to Venezuela: "You are not strong enough to get anything by force, and we won't arbitrate unless you first give up a part of the territory." This, he says, amounts to invasion and conquest. "There is but one feasible mode of determining the merits of the question, and that is peaceful arbitration. Great Britain has shown in various instances that she was willing to arbitrate her political and sovereign rights, when the interests or territory involved were not of controlling magnitude; thus she arbitrated the extent of her colonial possessions with the United States, twice with Portugal, once with Germany, and perhaps in other instances."

Mr. Bayard is directed to read the communication to Lord Salisbury and ask a definite decision regarding arbitration. The President hopes that the conclusion will be on the side of arbitration, but if he is disappointed, "a result not to be anticipated, and in his judgment calculated to greatly embarrass the future relations between this country and Great Britain," he wishes to be acquainted with the fact at such early date as will enable him to lay the whole subject before Congress in his next annual message.

LORD SALISBURY'S POSITION.

British Side of the Dispute Embodied in a Diplomatic Note.

Washington, Dec. 18.—The British side of the dispute is embodied in two notes from Lord Salisbury to Sir Julian Pauncefote. Lord Salisbury goes broadly into the Monroe doctrine. Extracts read as follows:

"The disputed frontier of Venezuela has nothing to do with any of the questions dealt with by President Monroe. It is not a question of the colonization by a European power of any portion of America. It is not a question of imposition upon the communities of South America of any system of government devised in Europe. It is simply the determination of the frontier of a British possession which belonged to the throne of England long before the Republic of Venezuela came into existence. But, even if the interests of Venezuela were so far linked to those of the United States as to give to the latter a locus standi in this controversy, their government apparently have not formed, and certainly do not express any opinion upon the actual merits of the dispute."

Of the relation which the Monroe doctrine bears to international law, Lord Salisbury says: "I have argued on the theory that the Monroe doctrine in itself is sound. I must not, however, be understood as expressing an acceptance of it on the part of her majesty's government. It must always be mentioned with respect, on account of the distinguished statesman to whom it is due and the great nation who have generally adopted it. But international law is founded on the general consent of nations, and 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."

On the relation which the Monroe doctrine bears to international law, Lord Salisbury says: "I have argued on the theory that the Monroe doctrine in itself is sound. I must not, however, be understood as expressing an acceptance of it on the part of her majesty's government. It must always be mentioned with respect, on account of the distinguished statesman to whom it is due and the great nation who have generally adopted it. But international law is founded on the general consent of nations, and 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."

With the expression of his hope and desire for a speedy and peaceable settlement of the dispute, the British premier concludes: "This controversy has undoubtedly been made more difficult by the inconsiderate action of the Venezuelan government in breaking off relations with her majesty's government, and its settlement has been correspondingly delayed; but her majesty's government have not surrendered the hope that it will be adjusted by a reasonable agreement at an early date."

In another note Lord Salisbury challenges Secretary Olney's statement that the dispute dates back to 1814, and asserts that it did not begin until 1840. He asserts that the recent difficulty would never have arisen if Venezuela had been content to claim only those territories which could be proved or even reasonably asserted to have been quietly in the possession of a captain general of Venezuela. He attacks the Spanish title to the lands as vague and ill-founded, and contends that to the validity of the Dutch title, under which Great Britain now claims, there exists the most authentic declarations. Lord Salisbury says: "The fundamental principle underlying the Venezuelan argument is that, inasmuch as Spain was originally entitled to right of the whole American continent, any territory on that continent which she cannot be shown to have acknowledged in specific and positive terms to have passed to another power can only have been acquired by wrongful usurpation, and, if situated to the north of the Amazon and west of the Atlantic, must necessarily belong to Venezuela as her self-constituted inheritor in those regions. It may reasonably be asked whether Mr. Olney would consent to refer to the arbitration of another power pretensions raised by the Government of Mexico, raised on such a foundation, to large tracts of territory which had long been comprised in the federation."

Salisbury says that no steps have been taken by the British authorities to exercise jurisdiction beyond the Schomburg line, nor to interfere with the proceedings of the Venezuelans in

the territory outside, although pending a settlement Great Britain cannot recognize these holdings as valid or conferring title. In conclusion he says: "Although the negotiations in 1890, 1891 and 1893 did not lead to any result, Her Majesty's Government have not abandoned the hope that they may be resumed with better success and that when the internal policies of Venezuela are settled on a more durable basis than has lately appeared to be the case, Her Majesty's Government may be enabled to adopt a more moderate and conciliatory course in regard to this question than that of their predecessors. Her Majesty's Government are sincere in their desire to be in friendly relations with Venezuela and certainly have no design to seize territory that properly belongs to her or forcibly to extend sovereignty over any portion of her population, but they cannot consent to entertain or to submit to arbitration of another power or of foreign jurists, however eminent, claims based on the extravagant pretensions of Spanish officials in the last century, and involving the transfer of large numbers of British subjects who have for many years enjoyed the settled rule of a British colony, to a nation of different race and language, whose political system is subject to frequent disturbance, and whose institutions as yet too often afford very inadequate protection to life and property. No issue of this description has ever been involved in the questions which Great Britain and the United States have consented to submit to arbitration and Her Majesty's Government are convinced that in similar circumstances the Government of the United States would be equally firm in declining to entertain proposals of such a nature."

THE BRITISH PRESS.

Comments of the Leading Papers on the Venezuelan Question.

London, Dec. 18.—All of the papers devote more or less of their editorial space to a discussion of President Cleveland's message on the Venezuelan question and to the merits of that question itself. The Daily Telegraph (liberal) publishes an editorial, contending that America has no concern in the Venezuelan dispute.

The Daily Graphic says: "Does President Cleveland seriously think that he can admit the proposition that the frontiers of European colonies in the two Americas are to be held at the good pleasure of a committee of Washington gentlemen? What would the United States have said in 1848 if we, as an American power, had advanced the claim, based on this principle, to protect Mexico from a wantonly aggressive war by which President Cleveland's predecessors settled the Texan boundary dispute?"

The Times acknowledges the gravity of the difficulties which have arisen between Great Britain and the United States, and proceeds to argue that the Monroe doctrine has never been recognized as international law and quotes Lord Salisbury's admission that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in the western hemisphere by any European state would be highly inexpedient. The Times contends further that England is bound to resist the extended claim of Monroeism, and says: "A power which has command of the sea does not regard 3,000 miles of intervening ocean as severing it from its subjects." The Daily News, the liberal organ, says: "Neither Secretary Olney nor President Cleveland seems to realize that the Monroe doctrine cannot be quoted as authoritatively in negotiations with a foreign power. The definition of Monroeism is a matter for Americans themselves. It binds nobody else."

The Standard, the conservative organ, in an editorial on the message, says:

"The position that President Cleveland assumes is preposterous. No American citizen would for a moment dream of admitting its soundness in any analogous case in which the honor and interests of America were concerned. There can be but one answer. We decline to humiliate ourselves and we refuse to accept the decision of Washington in such matters altogether outside its jurisdiction."

The remainder of the Standard's article is an echo of Lord Salisbury's argument and it concludes by saying: "Great Britain will reject the demands as indignantly as congress would if America were asked to submit her title to Alaska to the judgment of impartial umpires."

THE AMERICAN PRESS.

Much Attention Given to the President's Venezuelan Message.

The papers of the country devote more or less editorial attention to the president's Venezuelan message. Extracts from these expressions follow:

NEW YORK.

World—President Cleveland's message to congress on the Venezuelan matter is a serious blunder. It is a blunder because it is based upon a wrong conception, because it is not sustained by international law or usage, and because it places the United States in a false position. Great Britain owns more territory on this continent than we do. She was here before we were a nation. If she had the hostile intentions

which she need to wait for a boundary dispute, to assail us or to menace our bribe race, to assault us or to menace our republican institutions? The assumption is absurd. And with it falls the structure of ponderously patriotic rhetoric reared upon it by the president.

Journal—If England ventures to disregard the solemn warning which she has received, if she refuses to recognize the authority of the United States in the western hemisphere, if she persists in contumely the historic policy, she will be guilty of a distinct act of hostility which this nation is not afraid to go to war over, even with the mistress of the seas, to defend a principle, and which has twice before won her cause when the British have appealed to the arbitrament of arms.

Tribune—The president has spoken straightforward, manly words, which are worthy of, and which we believe will command, the approval and enthusiastic support of the people of the United States.

Sun—Mr. Cleveland has borrowed a new uniform, but all the time 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 we need not consider here, the people of the United States are solid and enthusiastic.

Herald—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. The crisis emphasizes the desirability of international arbitration.

Recorder—As an American president, Cleveland's resolute reaffirmation of the Monroe doctrine will be warmly welcomed and enthusiastically endorsed by men of all parties.

Staats Zeitung—Conditions have changed since the time of Monroe, and it would be more difficult today to say that the United States has an interest in the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela than in the earlier days when the United States had to care for its own defense.

Volks-Zeitung—President Cleveland has certainly upheld the rights of the Monroe doctrine with powerful language and warned England to look out or take the consequences—i. e., to prepare for a declaration of war from the United States. That's right.

CHICAGO.

Tribune—There is no mistaking the President's attitude on the question of the meaning and of the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine, and there is equally no question that the Republican Congress will sustain him enthusiastically and patriotically.

Inter Ocean—President Cleveland puts in unexceptionable language a ringing utterance of genuine Americanism, and without bluster meets the issue raised by the Monroe doctrine as boldly and as explicitly as did Secretary Adams and President Monroe when the gravest possible consequences threatened.

Chronicle—The issue is pointed enough to suit the most sensational temperament. Great Britain must abandon its claims to Venezuelan territory, the American Congress must relegate the Monroe doctrine to the limbo of forgotten dreams or the question must be left to the dread arbitrament of the sword.

Times-Herald—The nation is with the president. It makes no difference to us whether or not any foreign government may decline to admit validity of the Monroe doctrine. We are prepared to demonstrate its validity with the entire strength of sovereign people. Its assertion and enforcement are necessary to our place in the world.

Record—The message is a dignified but peremptory declaration that the Monroe doctrine is a sound international law, that the United States will abide by it, and that further aggressions in Venezuela will be met with resistance by every means in this nation's power.

WASHINGTON.

Star—The message is one of the most vigorous and patriotic state papers that ever emanated from the executive mansion.

Post—No president of this American union has ever given out an utterance more courageous, more inspiring, more splendid. It will rouse the country from one end to the other.

CINCINNATI.

Enquirer—Congress must sustain President Cleveland's position or else abandon the Monroe doctrine.

Commercial Gazette—No one could have asked for a stronger, more decisive or more vigorous support of the Monroe doctrine. War is a serious matter, but there are greater calamities than war—one of them is the loss of national self respect and honor.

RECEIVED IN THE HOUSE.

Legislators Listen Attentively and Applaud the Sentiments.

Washington, Dec. 18.—While the time of the House was mainly absorbed Monday in a debate on the Republican plan to create three committees, of nine members each, to deal with the election contests, its interest was centered upon the President's message. Although many members had already read it, nearly all of them remained in their seats and listened attentively to the reading. Several passages were

punctuated by applause. The conclusion of the reading was followed by loud applause on both sides.

Mr. Crisp was on his feet at the close with a bill, and Mr. McCreary (Dem., Kentucky, moved the reference of the message to the Committee of Foreign Affairs; but Speaker Reed referred it to that committee without a motion and recognized Mr. Dingley (Rep., Maine, who made a motion to adjourn until to-day, and this was carried.

The bill which Mr. Crisp tried to offer follows: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, that the sum of \$100,000 be and the same is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated 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."

The change of rules increasing the membership of committees was agreed to, with the exception of the clause changing the Elections Committee.

<