

UNCLE SAM, THE "MONK" AND HIS MASTER.

ARBITRATION IS WANTED BY BOTH.

England Eager to Join with America in Forming a General Treaty.

Text of the Official Correspondence Between Olney and Salisbury.

Great Britain Submitted a Plan Which Did Not Meet With Entire Approval Here.

United States Wants Arbitration in Questions of Territorial Rights Made Obligatory.

OLNEY'S FIRM STAND FOR VENEZUELA.

He Rejects British Proposals for Arbitrating the Boundary Dispute, Which Involved a Surrender of Some Claims of the Weaker Power.

Washington, July 17.—The efforts of the United States and Great Britain to agree upon a general arbitration treaty for the settlement of all controversies, through the establishment of a permanent tribunal as well as the progress of diplomatic negotiations toward solving the Venezuelan problem, are set forth in thirteen communications, made public by the State Department to-day. They constitute the first authoritative disclosures upon these great questions since President Cleveland's famous Christmas message to Congress.

Little substantial progress toward a general arbitration treaty is disclosed by the documents. An outline in part of the proposed procedure is laid down, and the views of the two governments are so explicitly stated that future discussion may be confined toward narrowing the few divergencies of method.

The further fact is made apparent that the United States has not relaxed its vigilance in demanding a just settlement of the Venezuelan land boundary question, and has rejected the British proposals for arbitrating that dispute under terms involving the surrender of any part of Venezuela's claims.

Bayard Opens Negotiations.

The correspondence opens with a letter from Ambassador Bayard to Lord Salisbury, dated February 27 last, stating that his instructions continued to indicate an urgent desire to have the Guiana boundary question removed as soon as practicable from the atmosphere of possible controversy, and proposing an entrance, forthwith, upon negotiations at Washington between the British Ambassador and the Secretary of State.

Mr. Bayard added that Secretary Olney greatly desired that there should be pronounced a clear definition of the "settlement" which it was understood, Great Britain wished excluded from the proposed arbitration.

Lord Salisbury, in reply, on March 3, said the Government readily concurred in the suggestion and had sent instructions to Sir Julian Pauncefote, directing him to discuss the question, either with the Venezuelan representative or the United States acting as the friend of Venezuela. He had asked the Secretary of State of the Colonies, he said, for the precise meaning attached to the word "settlements."

Lord Salisbury's instructions to Sir Julian Pauncefote, dated March 3, form the third document, and are devoted to the system for general international arbitration, negotiations for the establishment of which had been ruptured by Secretary Gresham's death.

Great Britain's Arbitration Plan.

Lord Salisbury submitted the following: Heads of a treaty for arbitration in certain cases.

1. Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States shall each appoint two or more permanent judicial officers for the purpose of this treaty, and on the appearance of any difference between the two powers which, in the judgment of either of them, cannot be settled by negotiation, each of them shall designate one of the said officers as arbitrator, and the two arbitrators shall hear and determine any matter referred to them in accordance with this treaty.

2. Before entering on such arbitration, the arbitrators shall select an umpire, by whom any question upon which they disagree, whether introductory or final, shall be decided. The decision of such umpire upon any introductory question shall be binding upon the arbitrators. The determination of the arbitrators, or, if they disagree, the decision of the umpire, shall be the award upon the matters referred.

Matters to Be Arbitrated.

3. Complaints made by the nationals of one power against the officers of the other, all pecuniary claims or groups of claims, amounting to not more than \$100,000, made on either power by the nationals of the other, whether based on an alleged right by treaty or agreement, or otherwise; all claims for damages or indemnity under the laws of the one power affecting diplomatic or consular privileges; all alleged rights of fishery, access, navigation, of commercial privilege, and all questions referred by special agreement between the two parties, shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with this treaty and the award thereon shall be final.

4. Any difference in respect to a question of fact, or of international law, involving the territory, territorial rights, sovereignty, or jurisdiction of either power, or any pecuniary claim, or group of claims of any kind, involving a sum larger than \$100,000, shall be referred to arbitration under this treaty. But if in any such case, within three months after the award has been reported, either power protests that such award is erroneous in respect to some issue of fact, or some issue of international law, the award shall be reviewed by a court composed of three of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Great Britain and three of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States; and if the said court shall determine, after hearing the case, by a majority of not less than five to one, that the said issue has been rightly determined, the award shall stand and be final; but in default of such determination it shall not be valid. If no protest is entered by either power against the award within the time limited, it shall be final.

As to Questions of National Honor.

5. Any difference, in the judgment of either power, materially affecting its honor, or the integrity of its territory, shall not be referred to arbitration under this treaty, except by special agreement.

6. Any difference whatever, by agreement between the two powers, may be referred for decision by arbitration, as herein provided, with the stipulation that, unless accepted by both powers, the decision shall not be valid.



Uncle Sam—Goll darn the "monk," doesn't he know that votes for him are the long green for his master?

provided, however, that either the Congress of the United States, on the one hand, or the Parliament of Great Britain, on the other, at any time before the arbitral tribunal shall have convened for the consideration of any particular subject matter, may, by act or resolution declaring such particular subject matter to involve the national honor or integrity, withdraw the same from the operation of this treaty.

Must Experiment for Results.

In the instructions Sir Julian is told that all matters in dispute cannot be referred to arbitration; that neither government is willing to accept arbitration upon issues involving national honor or integrity, but within this wide region the United States desires to go further than Great Britain.

Decision Shall Be Final.

In the case of controversies provided for by this article, the award shall be final if concurred in by all the arbitrators. If assented to by a majority only, the award shall be final, unless one of the parties, within three months from its promulgation, shall protest in writing to the other that the award is erroneous in respect to some issue of fact, or of law. In every such case the award shall be reviewed by a court, composed of three of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Great Britain and three of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, who, before entering upon their duties, shall agree upon three learned and impartial jurists to be added to said court in case they shall be equally divided upon the award to be made. To said court there shall be submitted a record in full of all the proceedings of the arbitral tribunal, which record, as part thereof, shall include the evidence adduced to such tribunal.

Cleveland Proposes Amendments.

But, by the direction of the President, he proposes the following substitute for Lord Salisbury's articles 4 and 5:

1. Arbitration under this treaty shall also be obligatory in respect to all questions now pending or hereafter arising involving territorial rights, boundaries, sovereignty or jurisdiction, or any pecuniary claim or group of claims aggregating a sum larger than \$100,000, and in respect of all controversies not in this treaty specially described.

exposed to influences not wholly favorable to its impartial consideration. It is liable to view the honor of the country as not distinguishable from the good of party. And if war and not arbitration is to be evoked, the direct representation of the people, at whose cost and suffering war must be carried on, should be properly charged with the responsibility of making it. By the scheme, as amended, the controversy is finally ended, whereas, under the original proposition, there would be an award only in rare cases in which the six appellate arbitrators favored it, either unanimously or by a majority of five to one.

To Include Venezuelan Dispute.

It only remains to observe that, if article 4, as amended, should prove acceptable, no reason is perceived why the pending Venezuelan boundary dispute should not be brought within the treaty by express words of inclusion. If, however, no treaty for general arbitration can be now expected, it cannot be improper to add that the Venezuelan boundary dispute seems to offer a good opportunity for one of these tentative experiments at arbitration which, as Lord Salisbury justly intimates, would be of decided advantage as tending to indicate the lines upon which a scheme for general arbitration can be judiciously drawn.

Olney on the Side of Caution.

These amendments, he argues, make all disputes prima facie arbitral and place where they belong—in Congress and Parliament—the right and power to decide whether they are arbitral or demand assertion by force of arms. The administration in authority, he says, when a serious international controversy arises, is often

ferences between individual and national rights to land which make it impossible to apply the well-known laws of real property to territorial dispute. In conclusion he says:

Objects to a "Foreign" Empire.

In these, under date of May 22, the British Premier foresees the possibility of failure in the attempt to agree on the general arbitration system and proposes a settlement of the Venezuelan dispute in which he declares that, from the first, it has been objectionable to subject to the decision of an arbiter, who in the last resort must, of necessity, be a foreigner, the rights of British colonists, who have settled in the country, believing it to be British.

Mr. Olney Stands Up for Venezuela.

But as Great Britain asks for the rule and Venezuela opposes it, the inevitable deduction coincides with the undoubted fact—namely, that the former's interest is believed to be promoted by the rule, while the latter's will be prejudiced.

Olney Stands Up for Venezuela.

Venezuela is not to be stripped of her rightful possessions because the British Government has encouraged its subjects to believe that such possessions were British. In but one possible contingency could any claim of that sort by Great Britain have even a semblance of plausibility, if Great Britain's assertion of jurisdiction, on the faith of which her subjects made settlements in territory subsequently ascertained

to be Venezuelan, could be shown to have been in any way asserted to, or acquiesced in by Venezuela, the latter power might be held to be concluded and to be estopped from setting up any title to such settlements.

Rights of the Weaker Must Be Regarded.

Secretary Olney declares that in the opinion of the United States, Lord Salisbury's proposals can be made to meet the requirements and justice of the case, only if amended along the following lines:

Wants Genuine Arbitration.

On the same day, June 12, Secretary Olney acknowledged the copy of Lord Salisbury's dispatch of May 18, and promised speedy consideration, but declared that in the meantime he desired to again call attention to the fact that so far as the Venezuelan dispute was concerned, the position of the United States had been plainly defined, not only by the Executive, but by the unanimous concurring action of both branches of Congress, and that a genuine arbitration, finally disposing of the controversy, would be cordially welcomed.

Olney Stands Up for Venezuela.

On the other hand, he declared that, while a treaty of general arbitration providing for a tentative decision merely upon territorial claims might be accepted by this Government as a step in the right direction, it would not feel at liberty to in-

clude the Venezuelan boundary dispute within the scope of such a treaty. "It is deemed advisable," he adds, "to be thus explicit in the interest of both Governments, that the pending negotiations for a general treaty of arbitration may proceed without any misapprehension."

SALISBURY IS SANGUINE.

Says the Diplomatic Question Involved in the Venezuela Dispute Will Be Easily Adjusted.

London, July 17.—In the House of Lords to-day Lord Salisbury laid upon the table the papers relating to the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela. Lord Salisbury, in presenting the documents, said that negotiations between Great Britain and the United States in regard to the Venezuela matter were still in progress.

The Government, he added, did not believe that the claim made by Venezuela was a suitable subject for arbitration, but when the facts in the case had been fully ascertained he thought that the diplomatic question involved could be easily adjusted.

The negotiations between the United States and Great Britain, both as to the matter of an arbitration treaty and the Venezuelan dispute, were still incomplete, he said, but they were advancing favorably. In pursuing the negotiations the Government had taken two courses. In the smaller question with Venezuela, upon which negotiations had been carried on with the United States, rather than with Venezuela, no conclusion had been arrived at. Difficulties had arisen from the fact that the claim made by Venezuela placed a very large proportion—about two-thirds—of British Guiana, including considerable territory which had been settled for a great number of years, under arbitration.

Olney's Final Point.

Secretary Olney then took into a legal discussion of international law, as applicable to territory, and closes with the following keen point:

By the original proposals of Lord Salisbury, contained in the dispatch of March 3 last, a protested award is to be void, unless obtained by the appellate tribunal of six Judges by a vote of 3 to 3. He has now suggested that such a protested award may be allowed to stand, unless a tribunal of five Supreme Court Justices set it aside for some error of some error in law.

GEN. PALMER FOR GOVERNOR

Albany County Men Offer the Secretary Their Support.

Albany, July 17.—Secretary of State John Palmer was waited upon at his office in the Capitol to-day by a committee representing the Albany County delegates to the Republican State Convention and was informed that he was their candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor. Mr. Palmer thanked the members of the committee, and made a speech in which he said he would do his best to support the party and give his conclusions to the chairman of the committee.

An curing consumption there's nothing like taking Time by the forelock. Doctors say consumption can't be cured; they have arguments to prove it. But when you see it cured right under their face and eyes by Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery, they admit that there's something wrong about their arguments and something wonderful about the "Discovery." It isn't miraculous. It won't cure every case; but it cures a surprisingly large percentage of cases, even when the patient is pretty far gone with a bad cough, and bleeding from the lungs, and reduced almost to a shadow. Consumption is a blood disease. The lungs want a fresh supply of pure rich blood and plenty of it; that is what the "Golden Medical Discovery" gives them. It is a blood-maker. It gives the blood-making functions power to produce a large quantity of the nourishing red corpuscles which make healthy life-giving blood. This stops the wasting; drives out the impurities; heals the ulceration and begins a rapid building-up process, of solid, substantial flesh and vital energy.

It isn't only consumptives who need the "Discovery." It cures every form of chronic blood-disease and all scrofulous and eruptive affections.

Mr. Isaac E. Downs, of Spring Valley, Rockland County, N. Y., writes: "For three years I had suffered from that terrible disease, consumption, and heart-disease. Before taking Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery I was wasted away to a skeleton; could not sleep nor rest, and many times wished to die to get out of my misery. I then took the Golden Medical Discovery and in a few days I began to feel better. I returned to my work and my health slowly but surely developed itself while taking the 'Discovery.' Today I tip the scales at one hundred and eighty-five pounds and am well and strong. The Golden Medical Discovery has also cured my daughter of a very severe case of blood-disease and she is now everything without success we purchased three bottles of your 'Discovery' which healed her perfectly." Yours truly,

Isaac E. Downs