SPAIN IS CONTRADICTED

Spanish Presentation of Saturday is Replied to.

JUSTIFICATION FOR UNCLE SAM'S DEEDS.

Complete Answer to All of Her Wild Allegations—Public Means of Hostile Hiding in America.

Paris, Nov. 8.—Friday's session of the peace commission began at 2:35 p. m. and ended at 5 p. m. When the sitting opened the American commissioners presented their Spanish colleagues the answer of the United States to the claims contained in Saturday's note on behalf of Spain. The document in which the American answer was set forth was signed of course by the secretary of typewritten notice. It was a refutation of the Spanish allegation (in) because the words "possession," "sovereignty" or "control" do not occur in the protocol clause relating upon the Philippines, the peace commissioners have no right to discuss them here, and that even if they did so it must be in the light of the alleged fact of an anterior sovereignty that Spain's sovereignty should not be impaired.

The Americans answered Spain's claim for the restitution of the Philippines, or money and customs collections taken by the United States officers since the capitulation of Manila, and made reply to Spain's claim for an indemnity on account of the alleged transgressions of the United States in the liberties of Spanish troops of Manila and for their subsequent captivity from being of service to Spain in the defense of the Philippines, the preservation and the preservation of property.

The American commissioners, in their reply, held that there was justification under the terms of the protocol for the discussion of the Spanish claim to the Philippine Islands, and they also claimed that the occupation of Manila is a military occupation, which gives the United States a right to collecting the revenues, administering the government and exercising all the functions of possession.

The joint session was short because Senor Montero Rios and Judge Day consented to the request of the Americans regarding the Spanish note, which was read without a formal reading of the paper, which would occupy many minutes in an ordinary newspaper, and an adjournment was taken until Saturday.

NO PROPORTIONS MADE.

It is quite safe to say that the Americans have made no proposition regarding the question of the Philippines but confined themselves to a discussion of the proposals and assertions made by Spain at the previous meeting. Just what were the terms of the American reply cannot, of course, be accurately stated. But despite persistent assertions here to the contrary, there is no ground, as has already been added, for the Spanish contention that the United States acquiesced, at the signing of the protocol, in the mere reservation by Spain of her Philippine sovereignty. This story originated recently in one quite well informed to have come from a high source not in sympathy with the United States.

The facts of the case are these: On July 26th last the Washington government received from Spain an inquiry as to the bases on which the war might be terminated. Four days later, or thereabouts, the information was forthcoming in a paper embodying the substance of the protocol, save for the use in the Philippine paragraph of the word "possession."

Before the response was formally presented to M. Cambon, Spain's representative in Washington, he suggested the substitution of the word "disposition." The United States government acquiesced. The substitution was made, the formal response was delivered to M. Cambon, who forwarded it to Madrid; and on or about August 7th Spain forwarded her reply which, as affecting the Philippine question, was evasive or ambiguous.

The issue relating to the Philippines, said the Spanish note, was "seen to our understanding quite indefinite. On the one hand the ground on which Dewey and Merritt found themselves to be entitled to occupy the bay, harbor and city of Manila, pending the conclusion of a definitive treaty of peace, and to that of conquest alone, in spite of the blockade maintained on the sea by the Spanish squadron, and on the ships established on land by a native supported and provided for by an American admiral, who hoisted in his own and the Spanish standard was waves over the city. On the other hand, the Spanish archipelago of the Philippines is in the power and under the sovereignty of Spain.

"Therefore the commissioners of Spain think that the temporary occupation of Manila should constitute a guarantee. It is said that Spain, in ceding the Philippines, the entire disposition and government of the Philippines, but as the initiative of the Federal government would seem valid, the Spanish commissioners must therefore declare that while accepting the cession of the Philippines they do not of their accord, recognize the sovereignty of Spain over the archipelago having to be ceded to the United States as to such relinquishment of the dominion of these possessions and the power of administration and government of which Spain is the legitimate and only owner and rightful sovereign. The government of her majesty accepts the third condition, with the above-mentioned reservation."

AMBIGUOUS NOTE.

This part of Spain's note was deemed unofficial, and it was thought that it called for some misunderstanding and it left unchanged, so nothing exactly the position of the Spanish government. It is now stated by Spaniards here that Spain's reply was intended to be a mere formality, and that the Spanish commissioners, Senors Montero Rios, Eulogio Garnica, addressed to M. Cambon, a conversation pending and that while the formal reply was sent from Madrid, it was delivered by him to convey Spain's acceptance of the cession of peace. The accuracy was stated to be correct and that the most direct and certain way of avoiding misunderstandings was to adhere to the text of the protocol, in which the negotiations for peace was to be undertaken.

After with this note was sent to M. Cambon a protocol embodying the article terms tendered to Spain, in the Spanish and French texts, on July 30th, or thereabouts. Immediately upon receiving them M. Cambon transmitted the protocol to Madrid, and received with a message from Senor Garnica, chief of the Spanish embassador, Senor Duke, stating that the Spanish government did not regard Spain's response to the peace terms as satisfactory or unavailable.

M. Cambon's message to Spain was as follows: "The Spanish government has decided to make protocol (preceding) in a protocol the basis upon which the peace negotiations will be opened. This must be entered upon. I honestly avoid this document."

The changes were in Spain about August 12th. Two days later M. Cambon notified Judge Day that he had received a cable from Madrid of the 10th. August 12th, in which Duke Almodovar, at the, the Spanish minister of Foreign affairs, informed the French Spanish government, by order of the queen regent, and conferred upon him (M. Cambon) full authority upon this and other formality the protocol drawn up complete accord between M. Cambon and Judge Day.

Thus on August 12th Spain sought a reservation of her Philippine sovereignty, and the Philippine sovereignty, and the Spanish government on August 10th, one week before, was ready to accept the terms of the protocol, the terms of the protocol, which, as we have seen, contained no reservation, the terms of the protocol were in what now set in the notes, follows, as they appeared in the protocol, which by American notes (before) formed part of the communication of the President to the Spanish government.

As for Spain's demand of Friday that for negotiations for peace should take place at Madrid for the return to her of the captured cities of the American forces and for the payment of her claims for the defense of her colonies, it is understood that the American commissioners have left the Spanish demands. It was said that the capitulation of Manila was a military capitulation, and that the Spanish troops in Manila were a military element, which surrendered the City of Manila to the American forces, and that the capitulation of government and placed them under obligations to preserve order and to exercise all the functions of sovereignty.

Spain's contention that the capitulation, in fact, was made with Dewey after the conclusion of hostilities is disclaimed had to disappear in her subsequent claim that the Philippines should be returned to her as the result of victories in the field, which, prior to the protocol, which provides for the conclusion following capitulation and not earlier.

PRIME MINISTER TALKS.

Lord Salisbury Makes a Big Speech at the Guildhall.

British Premier in His Response to the Toast, "Her Majesty's Ministers," Indulges in Plain Talk.

London, Nov. 8.—The annual banquet of the lord mayor of London took place at the Guildhall this evening. There were about 850 guests present. After the usual loyal toasts, the army and navy were toasted. Admiral Sir William Kennedy and Gen. Lord Wolseley responding for their respective forces, which were described as being in a perfect state of preparedness to meet any power disputing Great Britain's just claims.

The majority of the speeches showed that everyone realized the greatness of the crisis in the history of Salisbury, who, on rising to respond to the toast of "Her Majesty's Ministers," was received with prolonged cheers.

The premier began by saying that a succession of events almost had set a precedent for speaking at the banquet for a year past. He alluded to the murder of the empress of Austria, for which, the purpose of expressing the universal regret experienced on account of the crime and for expressing that Great Britain had accepted an invitation to take part in a conference which would be called to determine upon the means we have to propose to take in order to put an end to the murders. The marquis of Salisbury added that on the same date he was moved to say that he not for great have that legislation would abate "this hostile, malevolent affection of humanity."

CONCERT OF EUROPE.

After referring to a hesitatory measure to the British commissions in India in the Chinese question, and the concert of Europe, he said he was afraid that the concert of Europe was not quite as strong as it had been. At the same time he pointed out "patient application, sometimes with the moral strength of Europe, has at last succeeded in fulfilling the promise to the Christians of giving them a freedom under the sovereignty of the sultan."

Continuing, the premier remarked: "The situation of this most difficult problem has witnessed displays of splendid and unexpected qualities of diplomacy upon the part of the admirals, who have successfully accomplished what the cabinets of Europe had been unable to do. I have more times thought that if the cabinets were all dissolved and admirals were assembled in their places, Europe would get along better."

Turning to the crisis with France, the premier remarked: "We have had quite recently to consider whether the interests of Great Britain would be in jeopardy if we left the Nile valley, with great interest and consideration, the issue has received hopeful solution. The great interest and concern some displayed for France under circumstances of apparent difficulty, which, I think, have rather increased than diminished the friendship of Europe for a very dangerous and threatening storm.

FORHARMED.

"While nations were in suspense, the government was constantly found to take precautions that it should not be taken by surprise. Our preparations were great, prompt and effective, for the immediate security for them for present off. The fleet has been some time prepared for both ends of the concert of the fact that these preparations have not sufficient reason to be laid, in the other to any them at a moment's notice.

After referring to the various causes of friendly action arising out of these preparations, including the action of Spain and Germany, the speaker said: "I have spoken of the relations of Europe, the friendly and cordial relations of Europe, the friendly and cordial relations of Europe, the friendly and cordial