

United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should of course be conducted carefully and judicially and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records and facts in support of the claims of both parties.

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

In making these recommendations I am 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 arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows the supine submission to wrong and injustice and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor beneath which is shielded and defended the people's safety and greatness.

(Signed) GROVER CLEVELAND,
Executive Mansion, Dec. 17, 1895.

Accompanying the message is the correspondence on the subject, starting with Secretary Olney's celebrated note of July 20 last, to Mr. Bayard, reopening the negotiations with Great Britain looking to arbitration of the boundary dispute.

In this note, Secretary Olney, after stating that the proposition that America is in no part open to colonization has long been conceded, declares: "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 safeguard of which by any European power is to be deemed an act of unfriendliness toward the United States."

The secretary says this rule has been uniformly voted upon for 70 years, and cites instances of the diplomatic history.

Olney goes at length into the Venezuelan dispute, affirming that the British claim in two years apparently 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 possessions in Venezuela give it any right to be treated as an American state. He shows where Great Britain arbitrated other boundary lines, and declares it in effect says to Venezuela: "We are 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 an invasion and conquest, and our duty is summed up as follows:

"In these circumstances, the duty of the President appears to him unmistakable and imperative. Great Britain's assertion of title to the disputed territory combined with her refusal to have that title investigated being a substantial appropriation of territory to her own use, not to protest and give warning that the transaction will be regarded as injurious to the interests of the people of the United States as well as oppressive in itself, would be to ignore the established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. While the measures necessary or proper for the vindication of that policy are to be determined by another branch of the government, it is clearly for the executive to leave nothing undone which may tend to render such determination unnecessary."

Lord Salisbury's answer dated July 28, says the Monroe doctrine has undergone a "notable development" since its enunciation by President Monroe, which had originally received the entire sympathy of the English government. The dispute over the boundary has nothing to do with any questions dealt with by Monroe. The latter did not claim for the U. S. the novel prerogative of settling a difference of this kind, nor did he seek to establish a protectorate over Mexico or the Central American states. If the United States will not control the conduct of these communities, it cannot undertake to protect them from consequences attaching to misconduct. Arbitration is not free from defects, and the claim a third nation may impose on two interested nations cannot be justified and has no foundation in the law of nations.

International law being founded on the general consent of nations, no statesman and no nation, however powerful, can inject a novel principle not acceptable to any other government and Secretary Olney's principle that "American questions are for American decision," (unsustained by Monroe) cannot be sustained by international law. Monroe's language was never admitted to be international law and the danger of such a mission is shown by the "strange development" which the doctrine has received at Secretary Olney's hands.

In conclusion Lord Salisbury says he hopes the difficulty, made more difficult by the Venezuelans' inconclusive action in breaking the diplomatic relations, will be adjusted by a reasonable arrangement at an early date.

Lord Salisbury's note, dated July 25th, deals entirely with the boundary dispute on its merits. It begins with the statement that Great Britain does not recognize that any other country has any material interest in the controversy, and yet makes the statement in this fashion because, owing to the rupture of diplomatic relations, it is not otherwise possible to communicate it to the Venezuelan government. Salisbury asserts that Secretary Olney, acting on an ex-parte preer-

tation of the case by Venezuela, has fallen into much misapprehension.

FINANCIAL MESSAGE.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 20.—The following message was sent to Congress by President Cleveland today:

To Congress.—In my last annual message the evils of our present financial system were plainly pointed out, and the causes and means of the depletion of the government gold were explained. It was therein stated that after all the efforts that have been made by the executive branch of the government to protect our gold reserve by the issuance of bonds, amounting to more than \$162,000,000, such reserve then amounted to but little more than \$79,000,000; that about \$16,000,000 had been withdrawn from such reserve during the month next previous to the date of that message, and quite large withdrawals for shipment in the immediate future were predicted. The contingency then feared has reached us, and the withdrawal of gold since the communication referred to, and others that appear inevitable threaten such depletion of our government gold reserve as brings us face to face with the necessity for further action for its protection. This condition is intensified by the prevalence in certain quarters of a sudden and unusual apprehension and timidity in business circles.

We are in the midst of another season of perplexity, caused by our dangerous and fatuous financial operations. These may be expected to recur with certainty as long as there is no amendment in our financial system. If in this particular instance our predicament is at all influenced by the recent insistence upon the position we should occupy in our relation to certain questions concerning our foreign policy, this furnishes signal and impressive warning that even the patriotic sentiment of our people is not an inadequate substitute for a sound financial policy.

Of course there can be no doubt in any thoughtful mind as to the complete solvency of our nation, nor can there be any just apprehension that the American people will be satisfied with less than honest payment of our public obligations in the recognized money of the world. We should not overlook the fact, however, that aroused fear is unreasoning, and must be taken into account in all efforts to avert public loss and sacrifice of our people's interest.

A real and sensible cure for our recurring troubles can only be effected by a complete change in our financial scheme. Pending that, the executive branch of the government will not relax its efforts nor abandon its determination to use every means within its reach to maintain before the world the American credit, nor will there be any hesitation in exhibiting its confidence in the resources of our country and the constant patriotism of our people.

In view, however, of the peculiar situation now confronting us, I have ventured to herein express the hope that Congress, in default of the inauguration of a better system of finance, will not take a recess from its labors before it has, by legislative enactment or